

THE  
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM,

▲  
Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly.

T. C. BLAKE, D.D., EDITOR.

—••—  
*IN MEDIO TUTISSIMUS IBIS.*  
—••—

—  
Old Series, Vol. VII.—New Series, Vol. II.  
NO. III.—JULY, 1871.  
—

NASHVILLE, TENN.

OFFICE OF THE  
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM AND SABBATH SCHOOL GEM.  
1871.

## CONTENTS.

---

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. Language and its Uses. By Rev. M. B. DE WITT, Huntsville, Ala. ....	257
II. The Sojourn in Egypt. By T. C. ANDERSON, D.D., Lebanon, Tenn. ....	274
III. The "Eternal Now." By Prof. S. RICHARDS, Lincoln, Ill. ....	282
IV. Practical Theology. By A. J. BAIRD, D.D., Nashville, Tenn. ....	292
V. The Abrahamic Covenant. By Rev. J. W. POINDEXTER, Owensboro, Ky. ....	304
VI. The Power of the Cross. By Rev. J. M. HOWARD, Newburgh, Ind. ....	324
VII. Faith. By Rev. N. P. MODRALL, Jefferson, Texas. ....	334
VIII. "The Plymouth Pulpit." By S. G. BURNEY, D.D., Oxford, Miss. ....	342
IX. Mutability of Moral Distinctions. By Prof. R. V. FOSTER, Union City, Tenn. ....	365
X. The Church—its Strength. By Rev. J. S. GRIDER, Bowling Green, Ky. ....	373
Book Notices. ....	381







THE  
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

JULY, 1871.

---

ART. I.—*Language and its Uses.*

THE power of speech is a most wonderful faculty of man. No other creature on earth has been endowed by the great Creator with the ability to employ articulate language. The magpie and the parrot can utter many words learned from the lips of human beings, as the mocking-bird imitates many of the warblers of the grove; but the former are no more conscious of intelligent communication in what they repeat than is the latter in the multifarious notes which flow so freely from its open throat. The irrational creation has been favored with the instinctive capacity of making known its wants by certain inarticulate sounds and expressive signs. To man, as the head of the races of creatures on this globe, was given the use of language, by which to communicate a knowledge of manifold things connected with all kinds of subjects. The particular reason for this gift of speech is, evidently, that man is a being possessed of *mind*. Very few are the wants of the lower order of animals; food, shelter, and rest are the principal; physical need is all they know of want.

The wants of man are physical, intellectual, and moral. As a physical being, he possesses instincts in common with all animated nature, and can express his wants by inarticulate sounds and untaught signs. But the highest need of man is

intellectual and moral; and the glorious endowment of speech is the twin ornament of his noble gift of reason. Infantile necessities are mainly physical; and the mother, by the instincts of her nature, comprehends fully the motions and cries of the little one in expressing its wants, and relieves them. As soon as the growth of the child begins to develop the higher aspirations of its mental and spiritual constitution, Nature suggests the use of language; and the broken, lisping articulation commences. With the expansion of its intellect and contact with other minds, the attempts at the expression of ideas are repeated, and rapidly produce astonishing results. Thus, in a few years, the infant, knowing nothing, grows up to be the intelligent and cultivated youth whose speech is accurate, impressive, and beautiful.

At this stage of development, under favorable auspices, various appliances are used for the employment and training of the mental and moral faculties, so that *thought*, that wondrous talent in man, may be brought to its greatest possible perfection. While this is in progress, the power of speech is the leading instrument. Not a primary principle in education could be imparted without it; not a rule in the simplest lessons of philosophical, mathematical, linguistic, or ethical studies could be communicated but with it; and the highest walks of science, literature, art, religion, politics, and government, are dependent upon it equally with the most common-place interchanges of every-day social life.

Language, then, is the vehicle of thought, and it conveys from mind to mind, and from heart to heart, the manifold processes and experiences of human minds and hearts. By it the child makes known its little wants and expresses its innocent glee, and the philosopher embodies the profound researches of his penetrating genius. By it the beggar makes his piteous plea, and the teacher of divinity thunders the fearful sanctions of the law, or breathes the messages of gospel grace "in strains as sweet as angels use." By it the man of business adjusts his monetary transactions and promotes his golden gains; and, through this medium, the poet pours out the full volume of his rapt soul in numbers of ineffable beauty and witching power. By it the historian tells the

strange, sad story of nations and of individuals, and the orator kindles the passions of men into flames of patriotic devotion, or deceives the multitude into revolution, division, war, anarchy, and ruin. Along this channel flows the low, plaintive cry of the widow and the orphan; and with it the conqueror proclaims the glories of his triumphant career. In it the mother sings the very first soft lullaby to the tiny being nestling on her breast, and by it the astronomer reveals to mankind the telescopic discovery of magnificent worlds and stellar systems far beyond the range of natural vision. By it the coarse brawl of blasphemous natures is delivered to unwilling ears, and by it the sweetest melody and richest harmony of praise swell upward gladly to the skies. Through it the fearful wail of despairing spirits breaks upon the appalled senses of ministering attendants, and by it the ecstatic "Hallelujah" of happy souls, freed from fear and sin, and acknowledging the debt of infinite gratitude to God, fills all the place where deliverance has been wrought under the blessing of heaven.

Thus we see that all sciences, arts, wants, woes, joys, sorrows, feelings, and principles depend for their expression upon this medium of communication. And, undoubtedly, as we view the subject, the learned motto is the sentiment of our hearts, "*Vita sine literis est mors*" ("Life without letters is death"). Conceive of the world, in its present state of high progress in every department of thought and adventure, suddenly and utterly deprived of the power of speech. No individual could express a single want of his needy nature. No family could make known among its own members the commonest claims of mutual dependency, or reveal the facts of the most dreadful calamity which might befall one of their number. Communities would be thrown into inextricable confusion in all the relations of life, and madness would rule the hour. Nations of the grandest character and most formidable position would feel the dead-lock fastened upon all the energies of government, and resistless and fatal stagnation would still the pulsation of the heart of industry. International intercourse would cease in all but the weightiest matters of the world's concerns which might be discussed by correspondence;

intellectual and moral; and the glorious endowment of speech is the twin ornament of his noble gift of reason. Infantile necessities are mainly physical; and the mother, by the instincts of her nature, comprehends fully the motions and cries of the little one in expressing its wants, and relieves them. As soon as the growth of the child begins to develop the higher aspirations of its mental and spiritual constitution, Nature suggests the use of language; and the broken, lisping articulation commences. With the expansion of its intellect and contact with other minds, the attempts at the expression of ideas are repeated, and rapidly produce astonishing results. Thus, in a few years, the infant, knowing nothing, grows up to be the intelligent and cultivated youth whose speech is accurate, impressive, and beautiful.

At this stage of development, under favorable auspices, various appliances are used for the employment and training of the mental and moral faculties, so that *thought*, that wondrous talent in man, may be brought to its greatest possible perfection. While this is in progress, the power of speech is the leading instrument. Not a primary principle in education could be imparted without it; not a rule in the simplest lessons of philosophical, mathematical, linguistic, or ethical studies could be communicated but with it; and the highest walks of science, literature, art, religion, politics, and government, are dependent upon it equally with the most common-place interchanges of every-day social life.

Language, then, is the vehicle of thought, and it conveys from mind to mind, and from heart to heart, the manifold processes and experiences of human minds and hearts. By it the child makes known its little wants and expresses its innocent glee, and the philosopher embodies the profound researches of his penetrating genius. By it the beggar makes his piteous plea, and the teacher of divinity thunders the fearful sanctions of the law, or breathes the messages of gospel grace "in strains as sweet as angels use." By it the man of business adjusts his monetary transactions and promotes his golden gains; and, through this medium, the poet pours out the full volume of his rapt soul in numbers of ineffable beauty and witching power. By it the historian tells the

strange, sad story of nations and of individuals, and the orator kindles the passions of men into flames of patriotic devotion, or deceives the multitude into revolution, division, war, anarchy, and ruin. Along this channel flows the low, plaintive cry of the widow and the orphan; and with it the conqueror proclaims the glories of his triumphant career. In it the mother sings the very first soft lullaby to the tiny being nestling on her breast, and by it the astronomer reveals to mankind the telescopic discovery of magnificent worlds and stellar systems far beyond the range of natural vision. By it the coarse brawl of blasphemous natures is delivered to unwilling ears, and by it the sweetest melody and richest harmony of praise swell upward gladly to the skies. Through it the fearful wail of despairing spirits breaks upon the appalled senses of ministering attendants, and by it the ecstatic "Hallelujah" of happy souls, freed from fear and sin, and acknowledging the debt of infinite gratitude to God, fills all the place where deliverance has been wrought under the blessing of heaven.

Thus we see that all sciences, arts, wants, woes, joys, sorrows, feelings, and principles depend for their expression upon this medium of communication. And, undoubtedly, as we view the subject, the learned motto is the sentiment of our hearts, "*Vita sine literis est mors*" ("Life without letters is death"). Conceive of the world, in its present state of high progress in every department of thought and adventure, suddenly and utterly deprived of the power of speech. No individual could express a single want of his needy nature. No family could make known among its own members the commonest claims of mutual dependency, or reveal the facts of the most dreadful calamity which might befall one of their number. Communities would be thrown into inextricable confusion in all the relations of life, and madness would rule the hour. Nations of the grandest character and most formidable position would feel the dead-lock fastened upon all the energies of government, and resistless and fatal stagnation would still the pulsation of the heart of industry. International intercourse would cease in all but the weightiest matters of the world's concerns which might be discussed by correspondence;

and that would soon expire. The voice of song would be hushed; the laugh of childhood die away; the hum of business stop; the accents of friendship and love be no longer heard; the teacher's instructive explanations, and the pupil's well-gotten lessons, be unsaid; the courts of justice be entirely closed; and the Churches of Christ be left without a worshiper, and without a minister. Some idea is thus afforded of the inestimable value of spoken language among men. But when we consider the vast advantages of *written*, as well as spoken, language, and the skill and facility with which we are enabled to use both, then are we most fully impressed with the exceedingly great blessing of human speech.

A knowledge of many of the most elegant works of antique art, science, and industry has been communicated to modern nations by means of the productions of learned men of ancient times. The proudest cities and the most magnificent governments of the ancient world might have flourished, decayed, and passed away from the memory of men, had it not been for the ability of man to impart historical and other information by means of hieroglyphics and alphabetic writing. The beginnings and progress of all art, science, religion, social life, and civil administration would have been buried in the dust of oblivion, had it not been for this noble and elegant accomplishment. Tradition would have transmitted a bare reflection of the grandeur of the olden days of history, and the lapse of years would have finally extinguished the last gleam of light on the subject; so that the impressive words of John Foster would have been far more expressive, when he says, "Sesostris, Semiramis, Ninus—these mighty names remain now only as small points, emerging a little above that ocean under which all their actions lie buried. We can just descry, by the dying glimmer of ancient history, that that ocean is of *blood*." But by this wondrous art of written speech, we are made familiar with the names and characters, the deeds, the successes and failures of many of the most renowned men the world has produced in all periods of time. Poets and orators, sculptors and painters, musicians and architects, philosophers and divines, as well as military heroes and kings, stand before us, acting their parts in the

drama of history, or have transmitted to us the productions of their surpassing genius, by means of written language. Manifold and wonderful are the influences at work in the world's society of to-day, received from the literature of remote ages.

Homer is still the great standard of epic splendor and linguistic excellence for all cultivated nations, although he flourished nine hundred years anterior to the Christian era. The orations of Demosthenes and of Cicero are the study, admiration, and delight of living scholars the world over; and yet they speak to us only from the pages of the dead languages. The fame of Phidias and the glory of Apelles, have scarcely suffered diminution in the succession of many centuries, among the sculptors and painters of highest renown. Plato and Aristotle still teach their great principles of philosophy, although the sun of Bacon burst upon the world, in the seventeenth century, in fullness of glory. Alexander, Hannibal, and Cæsar are yet models of grand military chieftains. Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, Philip and Augustus, continue to instruct mankind in the workings and power of kingly authority. So might it be stated of all departments of human thought and action, excepting those which belong exclusively to modern discovery; but most especially may such things be said of the department of Divinity in the world's knowledge. The truest, holiest, *divinest* wisdom ever given was revealed by the infinite Author of Truth, "in the years of the ancient times," in solemn sanctions of law and testimony by Moses and the prophets, and in the ineffable beauties, glories, and power of gospel grace by Jesus Christ and his apostles. In this last view, we find the estimate of written language rising higher and higher, until it overtops our loftiest reason, extends beyond the boundary of the boldest imagination, and confines itself only to the possible well-being of the physical, intellectual, and spiritual nature of man. The recorded truths of the word of God, which letters have preserved with such perfect fidelity, through the revolutions of time, are the richest blessing the human family has ever enjoyed; and as the diffusion of the knowledge of them proceeds in rapid and increasing ratio, so the benefits of written language are more



and more spreading with the multiplication of "the leaves which are for the healing of the nations."

If, then, the gift of speech and the ability to record thought in suitable language were of such signal importance, and productive of so much pleasure and profit, in the earlier stages of human society, how preëminently true is this of the present age of the world! From the paucity of words, much difficulty was encountered, in the dawn of languages, in the expression of ideas. Many nations employed figures of various objects in nature to signify something else to the mind; and the rules by which these figures were used were by no means fixed and definite. The consequence was that utter confusion often reigned in the minds of men as to each other's meaning in many of the plainest matters of life, while subjects of higher thought were inextricably confounded one with another. As language advanced in the number and fixed signification of words, society became more and more molded, harmonized, and identified in the purposes, efforts, and results of common interest and mutual regard. High attainments in knowledge, however, in those primitive times were very rare, because of the general ignorance and the heterogeneous tastes and habits of men. There was little inducement for the most advanced thinkers to acquire knowledge of polite arts and learned sciences, since there were extremely few who could appreciate their acquisitions, or would make an effort to reap the benefits of them. The progress of language itself was slow and difficult, and much more so that of those studies in fields of knowledge so much dependent upon the state of language; nevertheless, the uses of speech were many and happy, and productive of general good to society even then. But, if these things were true at that period of history, far more so are they now in the astonishing advancement of learning and the perfection of the languages of cultivated nations.

What a happy and glorious heritage is ours, living as we do amid the meridian splendor of the sun of free thought, widespread industry, resistless energy, unchecked discovery, unlimited invention, and popular education! The attentive and studious boy of fifteen knows more now than the patriarch



of five hundred years in ancient days—yea, more than the majority of common society at eighty years of age three centuries ago. The expansion of science, the invention and improvement of printing, the increase of books, the multiplication of scholars, colleges, and universities, the augmentation of general knowledge, the much larger number of learned men, the higher training of mankind in the uses of mental and moral acquirements, the growth of mutual respect and brotherly love among all classes and nations of people, and, especially, the powerful influence of Protestant thought and life, have wrought vast and very wonderful revolutions and renovations in human society throughout the world; and it is a grand fact that the “end is not yet,” but the march of improvement is the march of a giant, whose footfalls are sounding farther and farther toward the utmost bounds of the world’s profoundest wants and highest development and happiness.

How deeply impressive and suggestive is the thought that this mighty progress in every useful invention, every elegant art, every noble science, every refining influence among men, is so greatly dependent upon the power, growth, and perfection of human speech! To fix the idea fully in the mind, let us institute a comparison between the English tongue and English-speaking population of Great Britain and the United States, and the Chinese language and people. In the use of the English, a child of five years may be quite expert, and be constantly and rapidly improving. The little primer, the simple spelling-book, and the monosyllabic reader, as well as the most learned body of Divinity, and most profound metaphysical philosophy, are composed of the twenty-six almost insignificant characters taken separately, each in itself meaning nothing, but in its combinations expressing almost all the possible conceptions, feelings, wants, and conditions of man. Every book, tract, or essay, every magazine, or newspaper, in English, discussing every conceivable variety of subjects, from the being and perfections of God, down to the nature and habits of a microscopic insect, depends entirely upon these little letters for the formation of every syllable, word, and sentence which it contains. Every preacher or lawyer, every

politician or teacher, every public speaker of English, makes use only of those few characters for the utterance of every word, and the expression of every thought, from the most eloquent appeal or most powerful argument, to the most common-place announcement or least important command. The smallest child, in asking for bread, employs the identical words which flow, in other connections, from the lips of the most astute professor in the demonstrations of the differential and integral calculus, or the development of the closest scientific investigations into the nature and origin of things.

This is a fact of such overwhelming significance that not many persons appreciate it, because of the general enjoyment of facility of speech, and of the privilege of the art of reading among English-speaking people. The diffusion of intelligence has come to be, like the diffusion of light or the atmospheric air, so general, that they who live amid its influences reap the benefit without realizing what has produced it. The perfection of our language has conduced greatly to these happy results. The people of England and of the United States are to-day among the leading civilizers and Christianizers of the world. They are among the principal promoters of all useful enterprises, and the teachers of the barbarous and semi-civilized nations of the globe. The colonies of Great Britain, for generations past, have, from time to time, been taking rank among independent nationalities, and growing into first-class political powers. These two nations, England and the United States, are breaking down the ancient barriers of seclusion set up by nations whose history dates back in the unknown regions of fabulous times, and are imparting to them the impulse of their own mighty moral, intellectual, and physical life. In temporal comforts, in intellectual advantages, and in moral excellence, these countries take an enviable rank. In every thing which elevates, refines, and blesses mankind, they abound. In all the relations in which man stands to God his Maker, Benefactor, and Saviour; in the relations of man to his fellow-men, considered as superiors, equals, or inferiors; or of man to woman, as a husband, to love, to cherish, to protect, to aid her in the accomplishment of a high, common destiny; or in the relationship of

parent to children who are to be guarded, guided, instructed, and led in the glorious career of immortals; in a word, in all the proper relations of man to all beyond himself, the inhabitants of these two countries occupy a high, important, and responsible position—higher, in fact, than that enjoyed by other nations. This is true primarily, because they have the great principles of eternal Truth in the Bible unfettered; and, secondarily, because they have a language of remarkable flexibility, strength, and energy, in which the facts and doctrines of that book of God are communicated freely to the humblest and to the most exalted.

Let us now turn our attention to the Chinese race and language. Here we behold a people so vast in numbers, and of such peculiar civilization, as to excite our curiosity and wonder. One-third of the living posterity of Adam is supposed to inhabit the immense regions under the imperial authority at Peking, making four hundred millions of subjects of the "Celestial Empire." What a tremendous host! It is impossible to form an adequate conception of such numbers. This huge population, in one grand army of progress, could march unobstructed over the wide domains of earth, and fill the whole world with its influence and achievements. Yet, while they boast of being the enlightened part of mankind, and treat with disdain all others who pretend to rank with them in material, social, and intellectual advancement, and while they have produced some learned and talented men who might have graced any court, or honored any nation, they are, as a people, narrow and distorted in their views; low, debased, and contemptible, in their tastes; vulgar, idle, corrupt, and detestable in their habits; mean, sycophantic, deceptious, and vain in spirit; uncultured, unlettered, and grossly ignorant in all real social, mental, and moral respects. A distinguished traveler says of them: "They can only be said to be great in trifles, while they are really trifling in every thing that is great." An eminent writer declares that "their letters, if we may so call them, are merely symbols of ideas; their philosophy is in so rude a state as hardly to deserve the appellation; they have no ancient monuments from which their origin may be traced, even by plausible conjecture; their

sciences are wholly exotic; and their mechanical arts have nothing in them characteristic of a particular family—nothing which any set of men in a country so highly favored might not have discovered and improved." An excellent authority on the subject is Chambers, of Edinburgh. He states that "civilization, as yet, has advanced but little beyond the infancy of what may be called agricultural society, in China. It may be readily admitted that they were among the first of nations existing which arrived at a certain degree of excellence; but it is not less evident that they have long remained stationary, and have even, in some respects, retrograded."

The picture which this writer draws of the Chinese is exceedingly dark and forbidding. All manner of crime is practiced without rebuke, and without penalty. The morals, the laws, the civil administration, and education among the people, are in a most fearful state of neglect, decay, and hopelessness.

Now, while China has four hundred millions of inhabitants, the British Isles have but thirty millions. China has an immense territory, two thousand miles in its greatest length, and fifteen hundred in breadth, with an area of one million three hundred thousand square miles. Great Britain has but one hundred and twenty-two thousand square miles of territory, and is an island, separate from the continent of Europe, with its large body of population. China dates her government back in the centuries long preceding the Christian era. England was in a comparatively rude state, with its monarchy just consolidated under Alfred the Great, one thousand years after Christ; yet England now stands in the front rank in commerce, manufactures, agriculture, arts, sciences, and religion, while China is in a condition far below in all these most important respects. The contrast is most striking. Britain is radiant with the light of social, intellectual, and spiritual blessings; China lies amid the deep shadows of portentous and gray-headed evils. Britain is a maiden, beautiful, fresh, rosy, and buoyant, beaming with the joy and promise of bright and cultivated youth who, with elastic step, bounds onward toward a glorious and unfettered destiny; China is an aged, wrinkled, and tottering form, whose life past, spent

in idleness, vice, and shame, has been a curse, rather than a blessing, to the world, and whose future is certain death, unless the system of its decrepit and abused body politic shall be rejuvenated in those waters of the spring of perpetual youth, which have purified and quickened the life of Western civilization.

The main causes of these most remarkable and real differences in the condition of two prominent nations which may be regarded as types of the Eastern and Western civilizations, are, first, the possession, by the one, of the Truth of God, revealed from heaven, which is the fountain of all social, mental, and religious development; and, secondarily, of the richest, simplest and most ample of languages for the conveyance of that truth, and all other intelligence, to every human being. Ready, rapid, and impressive communication of ideas has aroused the energies of all classes of persons throughout the English-speaking lands, and produced a high and increasing ratio of progress in every department of work.

Let us consider, for a moment, that, while the English language depends wholly upon twenty-six letters for all its infinite variety of utterances, and finds an incomparable ease and sufficiency in them for all its needs, the Chinese tongue has more than fifty thousand characters, each one of which must be separately learned, and must stand alone in its application for the particular object represented by it. Thus, while an unlimited number of words may be formed out of twenty-six original letters in English, it is necessary to learn fifty thousand symbols of ideas in order to express freely one's thoughts in Chinese. So, where a child can repeat, with rapidity and pleasure, the English alphabet, it would require a learned scholar to articulate the crude characters in the vocabulary of China. Thus we see why the unburdened tongue of the Englishman or American can traverse a wide region of thought, and be ever ready for the emergencies of progress and the developments of science, leaving time for the investigations necessary for the advancement of mankind in every industrial pursuit, and in every polite art.

Reflections like these might be made upon a survey of other languages and nations, and many interesting and in-

structive lessons might be learned in such an examination of comparative condition and progress. One grand principle, or one fact of history, coöperates with another, here and there, and wonderful are the combinations produced in society. The possession of language is man's peculiar and honorary dignity, in whatever state it may be enjoyed, and affords him the means of securing many valuable privileges. With the enjoyment of free speech, under the fostering institutions of an enlightened government, the field of activity is indefinitely expanded, and the energies and talents of a people are stimulated beyond conception. Then let these blessings be crowned with the haloes of heavenly truth, such as glitter on the pages of the word of God, and with the *perfection* of human speech, such as adorns the utterances of the pulpit when some Bryan or Davis proclaims the invitations of the gospel, or such as gilds the leaves of historic record when some Macaulay or Prescott wields the glowing pen, and we have the highest advantage and the noblest ornament which could be conferred upon the family of man.

The future of the human race is fraught with the deepest interest to the Christian philanthropist. The prevailing influences at work are evidently favorable to the vigorous progress of all true and auspicious growth in society. The power of free thought and of free speech is felt as a quickening impulse in the veins of social life, and many nations and races are waking up to the benefits of a liberal and thorough education of the masses. The high comparative position of English, American, German, and some other nationalities, is but an earnest of a still greater elevation of those countries in the scale of culture, and they are making rapid strides in their forward march. Other nations are emulous of distinction in this respect, and are endeavoring to shake off the shackles which have so long bound their limbs and confined their energies. Some are just receiving dim rays of early light, but scarcely have their eyes directed toward the source of coming day; while some are yet shrouded in deep and mysterious night, with little to cheer the vision of the political economist or the Christian philanthropist. But the revolving globe of human progress will inevitably bring the



dawn of the light; and, in the nearing to-morrow of the world's redemption, the meridian splendor of free speech and intelligence, with peace and love, will gloriously illumine the darkness of their present fearful condition.

"Come, bright Improvement! on the car of Time,  
And rule the spacious world from clime to clime;  
Thy handmaid arts shall every wild explore,  
Trace every wave, and culture every shore,  
Where barb'rous hordes on Scythian mountains roam,  
Truth, Mercy, Freedom, yet shall find a home;  
Where'er degraded nature bleeds and pines,  
From Guinea's coast to Sibir's dreary mines,  
Truth shall pervade th' unfathomed darkness there,  
And light the dreadful features of despair."

This grand consummation is to be achieved through the instrumentality of men and women who follow in the path of living labors in the fields of progress. The next few generations are to do wonders in this line of advancement. The educators of the future are in training to-day; and, indeed, they are educating for distant times to come. The discipline of mind and heart which the youth of our time are receiving is the index of the blessings of the future generations of men. Who does not see in this every noble motive to the highest excellence in every department of youthful training? To impress the hearts and minds of unborn thousands by the earnestness of faithful teaching; to mold the character and form the principles of myriads yet to be; to transmit a heritage of superior intelligence to the last ages of men—all this cannot be too well appreciated by the guardians and agents of popular education. Formidable obstacles of almost every description are to be overcome; but the history of the past ages shows that there are no difficulties to be surmounted, or problems of social ethics to be yet solved, the like of which have not already been fully mastered, and the hope inspired of brightening the whole earth with the glory of truth. The Saharas of mind and heart, which stretch their parched and pitiable lengths and breadths in great tracts over the world, shall yet bloom with the freshness, and be cheered by the fragrance, of perennial verdure and flowers.

With this view, what auspicious hopes should swell the hearts of the youth of the day, just entering upon the high career before them! The unexampled march of mind has thrown them into a region of unprecedented intellectual vigor. The elements of mental power and social excellence are opening more and more to the commonest understanding. Profound mysteries of the past are plain, unchallenged facts of to-day. Many perplexing riddles of to-day will be the playthings of childhood in the next age or two. The wondrous *arcana* of Nature are rapidly revealing themselves, not to confidential ears only, but to the general mass of secret-lovers; and the vast store-house of treasures is contributing its riches to the manifold wants and pleasures of man. The globe will soon be girdled by bands of iron, and electrical lines will reach every habitable spot. The heretofore long and fearfully dangerous circumnavigation of the earth will soon be reduced to a comparatively few days' journey on the lightning express-trains, or in the magnificent atmospheric cars which shall yet cleave the upper air in safe and speedy transit from zone to zone, and from continent to continent. Anglo-Saxon force of character and free speech will make itself felt to earth's remotest bounds, and carry every blessing of God's gift and man's skill to the very last island of the ocean.

What a privilege to be an agent in the dissemination of these blessings to the inhabitants of all lands! Who does not aspire to so honorable a position? The commonest educated mind can do a noble part in the beneficent work; and the gifted and accomplished intellects of the time have a grand theater of action. What toil—patient, believing, hoping, loving toil—should be performed in order to a thorough preparation for the expanding stage of the future! How should the undivided interest of the heart be concentrated upon the mental and moral qualifications necessary for the august responsibilities and splendid achievements of the coming scenes of time!

Every generation following will arise to a higher position than that of the one preceding; and the final attainments of the race it is impossible to conceive. No preparation, therefore, can be too thorough for the approaching grand works of



muscle and mind. The youth of both sexes should awake and gird themselves fully for the duties which will devolve upon them in their mission in life. The boy and the young man of the present age must, of course, be the men of the next. How shall they gain the eminence and ascend to a higher place than that of those who have passed off from the fields of successful labor? Not by self-indulgence; not by indifference; not by meager preparation; not by "waiting for something to turn up;" not by the patronage of wealth or the smiles of power; not by the idleness and ease in which so many delight; but by study; by self-discipline; by unwearied patience, and all-conquering perseverance; by fidelity to principle; by "forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those which are before, and pressing toward the mark for the prize." They who pursue the latter course will be the authors, leaders, molders, masters of thought, of work, of grand results. They who set their mark high, and never falter in their career, will be able to smile away darkness, condemn difficulties, solve hard problems, arouse dormant natures around them, weld other hearts together in sweet accord, calm the storms of human agitation, and give tremendous impulses of peace, light, and power to succeeding ages.

The girls and maidens of to-day are to be the matrons of to-morrow. Their influence will be powerful for good or fearful for evil. According to the peculiarity of their mental and moral character will be the nature of their influence. If intelligent, cultivated, and pious, their energies will be given to every holy work, and will accomplish most happy results. In the sacred missions of daughter, sister, wife, and mother, their hearts will be the fountains whence shall flow sweetest streams of pity, mercy, and love; their cultivated intellects will emit the most glowing beams of sentiment, thought, and truth; their gentle, refined, and graceful manners will adorn all the private walks of life, and make home the holiest, happiest spot on this checkered earth. But should they be ignorant, uncultivated, and ungodly, woe be to the community where they may dwell, and ruin to the nation whose matrons are composed of those of this type.

In the light of these impressive views, how profoundly do our hearts feel the responsibility of the ministry, of parents, teachers, and others, who have charge of the growing intellects and susceptible hearts of our children and youth! Their education is a subject of primary importance. To fit them, first, for home and home life, by discipline of heart, by training of thought, and by cultivation of manners; to qualify them, in the next place, to develop the powers of language; to prepare them well to leave the inspirations of their genius upon the printed page, to charm the eye, and ravish the ear with their artistic skill; and above all and through all, to teach them to look with faith, hope, and love into "the land of the hereafter," and to behold the highest happiness and fullest excellence of man attainable only by living to the glory of God—these, these are the blessed results to be accomplished; and wise shall we be, if we are faithful to the solemn trust committed to our care. Let the spirit of every teacher of youth be richly endued with wisdom from above. Let the familiar words of the grand old bard of England express the sentiment of all hearts, "Let all the ends thou aimst at be thy country's, thy God's, and truth's." Let this be the charge to the youth of our country: Lay broadly and deeply your foundations of character; build strongly and symmetrically your edifice; grace it with the fluted column, and twine round it the wreaths of beauty; close it in with a roof of enduring material; erect upon it the splendid and many-sided observatory; and then gaze out over the magnificent works of Him who "hath made every thing beautiful in its time," and up into the glorious heavens where scenes of incomparable grandeur lie. Let your motto be, "Onward and upward, and true to the line." Victory will crown the brow of the faithful; but, whether the end shall be triumph or defeat, the heart-felt consciousness of truth, fidelity, and right will indemnify for all losses, and ultimately fill the soul with the serenity of calm and perfect peace.

"The shades of night were falling fast,  
As through an Alpine village passed  
A youth who bore, 'mid snow and ice,  
A banner with the strange device,  
Excelsior!

"His brow was sad; his eye beneath  
Flashed like a falchion from its sheath,  
And like a silver clarion rung  
The accents of that unknown tongue,  
Excelsior!

"In happy homes he saw the light  
Of household fires gleam warm and bright;  
Above, the spectral glaciers shone,  
And from his lips escaped a groan,  
Excelsior!

"'Try not the pass!' the old man said;  
'Dark lowers the tempest overhead,  
The roaring torrent's deep and wide!'  
And loud that clarion voice replied,  
Excelsior!

"'O stay!' the maiden said, 'and rest  
Thy weary head upon this breast!'  
A tear stood in his bright blue eye,  
But still he answered, with a sigh,  
Excelsior!

"'Beware the pine-tree's withered branch!  
Beware the awful avalanche!'  
This was the peasant's last good-night;  
A voice replied, far up the height,  
Excelsior!

"At break of day, as heavenward  
The pious monks of Saint Bernard  
Uttered the oft-repeated prayer,  
A voice cried through the startled air,  
Excelsior!

"A traveler, by the faithful hound  
Half-buried in the snow was found,  
Still grasping in his hand of ice  
That banner with the strange device,  
Excelsior!

"There, in the twilight cold and gray,  
Lifeless, but beautiful, he lay;  
And from the sky, serene and far,  
A voice fell, like a falling star,  
Excelsior!"

ART. II.—*The Sojourn in Egypt.*

ABRAHAM, the progenitor of the Israelites, dwelt in Mesopotamia, when the Lord called him to leave his land and kindred, and go unto a land which he would show him. And he departed, not "knowing whither he was going." The Lord led him to Canaan, and gave him that goodly land. But a famine ensuing, he went down to Egypt, and sojourned there for a time. And when the famine was past, he returned to Canaan, and dwelt at Hebron. Here he prospered, and acquired vast flocks and herds. At his death, he left his son Isaac all his vast possessions.

In the days of Isaac, a famine drove him from Canaan, and he went down into the land of the Philistines, and sojourned at Gerar. And "Isaac sowed in that land, and he received, in the same year, a hundred-fold; and he waxed great and grew rich, and had possessions of flocks and herds, and great store of servants." As the Philistines envied and hated him, he returned to Canaan, and dwelt at Beersheba. Abimelech, king of the Philistines, visited him at Beersheba, and made a treaty with him.

When Jacob's sons sold their brother Joseph to the Ishmaelites, they carried him down to Egypt, and sold him as a slave to Potiphar, captain of Pharaoh's guard. He was a faithful servant, and soon became a favorite. So handsome was he that Potiphar's wife became enamored of him, and endeavored to entice him to sin; but when he repelled her advances, she complained to Potiphar that Joseph had insulted her. Joseph was then arrested and put in prison; but he found favor with the keeper of the prison, who committed to him the supervision of the other prisoners. Joseph, after interpreting the dreams of the chief baker and the chief butler, was brought out of prison, that he might interpret the dream of Pharaoh. The king was impressed with the interpretation, and responded to Joseph, "Forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this, there is none so discreet and wise as thou art; thou shalt be over my house; and, according to

thy word, shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. See, I have set thee over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh took off his ring from his hand, and placed it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestments of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; and made him to ride in the second chariot which he had; and they cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all Egypt. And he gave him to wife Asenath, daughter of Potiphar, priest of On." Joseph was at this time thirty years of age. "During the seven years of plenty, he went through all the land, and laid up all the surplus corn in the cities;" "and he gathered corn until he ceased numbering, for it was without number." The providence of God overrules the purposes of wicked men. Joseph's brethren, through envy, sell him as a slave. He is taken to Egypt. He is enticed to sin; he refuses, and is cast into prison. God inspires him with ability to interpret dreams. Pharaoh has a remarkable one; Joseph interprets it, and becomes Prince of Egypt.

From the statement that the father-in-law of Joseph was priest of On, we learn that this city was at that period the capital of Lower Egypt. On, in the Coptic language, signifies light, or the sun. We infer, therefore, that the priest of On presided over the worship of the sun as God, or rather as the *abode* of Jehovah, and the brightest image of his glory. This was the earliest form of idolatry, and is known to have been prevalent, not only at On—which, on that account, was called by the Greeks Heliopolis—but also in Upper Egypt, where there was a temple in which the sun was worshiped. On was situated on the eastern margin of the Nile, immediately opposite the head of the Red Sea, just where Mizraim and his tribe would reach the Nile. On this account it has been supposed to have been the first or oldest city in Egypt, and the first founded upon the African continent. As late as the days of Herodotus, On had a temple dedicated to the worship of the sun. It remained the capital of Lower Egypt till Memphis rose on the plain, west of the Nile. Then the government was transferred to Memphis; but On still remained the "Sacred City"—the Jerusalem of Egypt, and the abode

ART. II.—*The Sojourn in Egypt.*

ABRAHAM, the progenitor of the Israelites, dwelt in Mesopotamia, when the Lord called him to leave his land and kindred, and go unto a land which he would show him. And he departed, not "knowing whither he was going." The Lord led him to Canaan, and gave him that goodly land. But a famine ensuing, he went down to Egypt, and sojourned there for a time. And when the famine was past, he returned to Canaan, and dwelt at Hebron. Here he prospered, and acquired vast flocks and herds. At his death, he left his son Isaac all his vast possessions.

In the days of Isaac, a famine drove him from Canaan, and he went down into the land of the Philistines, and sojourned at Gerar. And "Isaac sowed in that land, and he received, in the same year, a hundred-fold; and he waxed great and grew rich, and had possessions of flocks and herds, and great store of servants." As the Philistines envied and hated him, he returned to Canaan, and dwelt at Beersheba. Abimelech, king of the Philistines, visited him at Beersheba, and made a treaty with him.

When Jacob's sons sold their brother Joseph to the Ishmaelites, they carried him down to Egypt, and sold him as a slave to Potiphar, captain of Pharaoh's guard. He was a faithful servant, and soon became a favorite. So handsome was he that Potiphar's wife became enamored of him, and endeavored to entice him to sin; but when he repelled her advances, she complained to Potiphar that Joseph had insulted her. Joseph was then arrested and put in prison; but he found favor with the keeper of the prison, who committed to him the supervision of the other prisoners. Joseph, after interpreting the dreams of the chief baker and the chief butler, was brought out of prison, that he might interpret the dream of Pharaoh. The king was impressed with the interpretation, and responded to Joseph, "Forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this, there is none so discreet and wise as thou art; thou shalt be over my house; and, according to

thy word, shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. See, I have set thee over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh took off his ring from his hand, and placed it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestments of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; and made him to ride in the second chariot which he had; and they cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all Egypt. And he gave him to wife Asenath, daughter of Potiphar, priest of On." Joseph was at this time thirty years of age. "During the seven years of plenty, he went through all the land, and laid up all the surplus corn in the cities;" "and he gathered corn until he ceased numbering, for it was without number." The providence of God overrules the purposes of wicked men. Joseph's brethren, through envy, sell him as a slave. He is taken to Egypt. He is enticed to sin; he refuses, and is cast into prison. God inspires him with ability to interpret dreams. Pharaoh has a remarkable one; Joseph interprets it, and becomes Prince of Egypt.

From the statement that the father-in-law of Joseph was priest of On, we learn that this city was at that period the capital of Lower Egypt. On, in the Coptic language, signifies light, or the sun. We infer, therefore, that the priest of On presided over the worship of the sun as God, or rather as the *abode* of Jehovah, and the brightest image of his glory. This was the earliest form of idolatry, and is known to have been prevalent, not only at On—which, on that account, was called by the Greeks Heliopolis—but also in Upper Egypt, where there was a temple in which the sun was worshiped. On was situated on the eastern margin of the Nile, immediately opposite the head of the Red Sea, just where Mizraim and his tribe would reach the Nile. On this account it has been supposed to have been the first or oldest city in Egypt, and the first founded upon the African continent. As late as the days of Herodotus, On had a temple dedicated to the worship of the sun. It remained the capital of Lower Egypt till Memphis rose on the plain, west of the Nile. Then the government was transferred to Memphis; but On still remained the "Sacred City"—the Jerusalem of Egypt, and the abode



of the priesthood. There seem to have been other cities in Lower Egypt in Joseph's day; for it is said that he gathered all of the surplus grain during the seven years of plenty, and "laid it up in the cities." And it is generally known that, at a later period, there were many cities on the Nile, and within the Delta; doubtless several of them flourished in Joseph's day. One lone column of granite, seventy feet high, still marks the site of On, and some ruins indicate the locality of Rameses and other cities. In the time of Herodotus, the priesthood of On still enjoyed great celebrity. Here Plato studied philosophy, and Strabo wrote history, and other *savans* acquired the knowledge that rendered Greece famous for science and song.

A famine prevailed in Canaan in Jacob's day, and he sent his sons down to Egypt, to buy corn. Joseph was then Prince of Egypt, and superintended the sale of the corn, which he "laid up in treasure cities" during the seven years of plenty. Jacob's sons came to him to buy corn. He recognized his brethren, but they did not know him; and, perceiving that he was not recognized, he treated them as strangers, and accused them of being spies. He had them put in prison; but they were subsequently released, upon condition that they would bring their youngest brother Benjamin down to Egypt. They returned with their corn, leaving Simeon in prison, as surety that they would bring their brother Benjamin. When they returned with Benjamin, Joseph made himself known to his brethren, and sent for his father. When they returned with the old patriarch, a residence was given to him in the "best of the land, even the land of Goshen." The district bordering on the eastern branch of the Nile, extending from the vicinity of On, northward to the Mediterranean, and eastward to the head of the Red Sea, was, doubtless, "the land of Goshen." Along the Nile lay the best wheat lands in the world, as in that day it produced "a hundred-fold," while the district between this alluvion and the Red Sea afforded, at that day, fine grazing for the flocks and herds. Some authors have expended much labor in vain, attempting to prove that Goshen was *within* the Delta; but that section, with its lagoons and quicksands, and its liability to overflow



could not have been regarded as the "best of the land." Besides, there is no evidence that the Israelites ever crossed the Nile. In that memorable night of their departure from Egypt, how could three millions of souls, with all their flocks and herds, have crossed the river, and then "journeyed from Rameses to Succoth" the first day? Encumbered as they were, and loaded down with the spoils of the Egyptians, which they had "borrowed," it was simply impossible. It is known, also, that both Rameses and Succoth were *east* of the Nile, as was also Goshen.

When Jacob died, he was embalmed, and the Egyptians and all Israel mourned for "three-score and ten days." Then Joseph went to Canaan to bury his father, and with him all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt, and all the house of Joseph and his brethren; only the little ones, and their flocks and herds, they left in the land of Goshen. And they buried Jacob in the cave of Machpelah, which Abraham had bought for a burying-place. Then Joseph and the host of Israel returned to Egypt. Such was the distinguished respect paid by the Egyptians to the remains of the patriarch Jacob. Joseph and his brothers dwelt in great harmony till Jacob's death, at the advanced age of "one hundred and ten years." When he was assured of the approach of death, he called his brethren together, and had them take an oath that they would convey his remains back to Canaan, and inter them in the cave of Machpelah.

Seventy souls of Israel came into Egypt; but they multiplied exceedingly, "and the land was filled with them." And when another king came to the throne, "that knew not Joseph," he set over them "task-masters, to afflict them with heavy burdens." At this period, it would seem that all Israel had been reduced to slavery, and that they were all engaged in making brick. From the statement that this king "knew not Joseph," we might infer that a new dynasty had come to the throne of Lower Egypt. Accordingly, the monuments of Egypt show that, about this period, the king of Thebes and Upper Egypt overran and subjugated Lower Egypt, and, according to the custom of that age, treated

those that had been subdued as their slaves; and, as the cities had been dilapidated by war, the conqueror employed his prisoners in rebuilding them. But hard labor, so far from diminishing, only increased the number of the Israelites. The more they oppressed them, the more they multiplied. "And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage." This "hard bondage" is in strong contrast with the kindness and indulgence shown to Israel by former kings; and we are led to inquire, Why this change of policy?

Though the history of the sojourn is brief, yet the time was four hundred and thirty years. Vast changes and revolutions must have occurred in Egypt during this period. Thebes, at that time, was the renowned city of the world, that "poured forth her chariots through a hundred gates" for the conquest, not only of Egypt, but of Western Asia. The change of dynasty in Lower Egypt occurred, according to the records upon the monuments of Thebes, during the sojourn of Israel in Egypt. It is remarkable that, in the history of this sojourn, no mention is made of Thebes or of Memphis, when certainly the former, and possibly the latter, was the seat of government during a part of the time. As the Israelites were located east of the Nile, and Memphis was on the west, and remote from Goshen, if Memphis was the seat of government during any part of the sojourn, it is probable that the Israelites and the province east of the river were governed by a viceroy, and consequently had no intercourse with Memphis. It is recorded, indeed, on the monuments of Thebes that, while it held Lower Egypt, that section was under the government of a viceroy. Doubtless Israel was thus governed when Moses was born, as the murderous edict for the destruction of the infants was then in force. We may presume that it continued up to the exodus from Egypt; for when Moses had attained to manhood, he visited his brethren to see how they were faring under their task-masters.

While in Midian, Moses married the daughter of Jethro, priest of Midian; and after a long sojourn in that land, the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire, out of the midst of a burning bush, and commanded him to return to Egypt, and demand of Pharaoh the release of the Israelites, that they

might return to Canaan. The Lord not only commissioned him to demand of Pharaoh the release of the Israelites, but he gave him power to work miracles, that he might thereby attest the truth of his mission.

While he was on his journey back to Egypt, the Lord said unto Aaron: "Go into the wilderness to meet thy brother Moses. And he went and met him in the mount of God, and kissed him." Then Moses communicated to Aaron all that had transpired in the "mount of God." And when they came into Egypt, they gathered together all the elders of the children of Israel; "and Aaron spake all the words which the Lord had spoken unto Moses." In attestation of the truth of their commission from God to lead Israel out of Egyptian bondage, Moses performed various miracles with his wonder-working rod. When they learned that the Lord had once more visited Israel, "then they bowed their heads and worshiped." Then Moses, with Aaron as his speaker, sought an interview with Pharaoh, and communicated to him the strange intelligence that Jehovah had appeared unto Moses, and commanded him to lead the Israelites out of Egypt to their own land. But he inquired, "Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go?" They renewed the request that they might be permitted to go three days' journey into the wilderness, to sacrifice to their God, "lest he afflict them with pestilence." But Pharaoh refused, and ordered the task-masters to require the usual number of bricks, but to furnish no straw. So much time was spent in gathering "stubble for straw," that they failed to make the usual number of bricks, and were beaten by their task-masters. Then they complained to Moses, and he made his complaint to the Lord, and received the promise that Israel should be delivered from bondage, and restored to the possession of their inheritance in Canaan. Moses then went to Pharaoh to obtain permission for Israel to return to Canaan; but he peremptorily refused. Then followed the "plagues of Egypt."

At first, Pharaoh "hardened his heart;" but when darkness—"thick darkness that could be felt"—covered the land for "three days," while yet the children of Israel "had light," then he consented that they might go, but they must leave

their flocks and herds. Moses refused to submit to this robbery. Pharaoh then drove him from his presence, and forbade another interview. That night, the first-born of every family of the Egyptians died, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat upon the throne, to the first-born of the maid-servant that was behind the mill. Then Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron by night, and said: Rise up and get ye out from among my people, both you and the children of Israel, and go serve the Lord as ye have said. Then Israel gathered their families, and their flocks and herds, and bade a final adieu to the land of their bondage; and they journeyed on foot from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand men, besides women and children. Lyman's Historical Chart places the exodus from Egypt 1491 years before Christ. As Israel numbered 600,000 men, besides women and children, the whole population that came out of Egypt must have been about 3,000,000.

When Pharaoh let Israel go, God led them not through the "land of the Philistines," though that was the direct and usual route, "lest they repent when they see war;" but he led them "by the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea." The direct route from the land of Goshen to Hebron would have been a brief journey—one that the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had all traveled, and carried up corn from Egypt to Hebron. "But God led the people about through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea." When they were near the head of the sea, he commanded them to turn southward, down the western coast. And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day and by night. While they were on the route that leads around the head of the sea, they were constantly approaching Canaan; but when, by the command of the Lord, they turned down the western coast, they were receding from Canaan, and approached nearer to Egypt and the pursuing host. That enabled the Egyptians to reach the sea in front and rear, and thus hem them in, leaving no way of escape but through the sea, or the inclosing lines of the enemy. When the Israelites perceived that they were thus hemmed in, they were terror-

stricken, and made loud complaints against Moses; but he said: "Fear not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord, which he will show you to-day: for the Egyptians whom ye have seen to-day, ye shall see no more forever." "And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward; but lift thou up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it; and the children of Israel shall go on dry ground through the midst of the sea." Thus, by a stupendous miracle, the Israelites crossed the sea and passed through the wilderness to Sinai, where, from its fiery summit, Jehovah, with voice awful as thunder, delivered to the congregated millions of Israel the moral law, and instructed them in the appointed sacrifices.

After wandering forty years in the wilderness, having been fed, during that long period, on "bread from heaven," the host of Israel reached the promised land. That the providence and power of Jehovah were employed in leading them out of Egypt, is as manifest as any other fact of history. This being admitted, the question is raised whether providence led them *into* Egypt. We have no manifest display of his power connected with the going down into Egypt; yet there seems to have been a providence leading, guiding, and protecting Abraham and his posterity. The promise had been given that in his seed the nations of the earth should be blessed. That promise implies a providence for the preservation of his posterity. The frequent famines that visited Canaan in that age rendered subsistence precarious. Abraham himself had to "go down into Egypt and sojourn there," in order to obtain subsistence. Israel went down to Gerar and sowed and gathered there an immense crop. Jacob reared his large family in Padan-aram; and, after he had returned to Canaan, he had to depend upon Egypt for bread. Joseph was sold as a slave; but, by the providence of God, he was conveyed to Egypt, and became chief captain, "that he might save much people alive." Accordingly, when the "seven years of famine came," he sent for his father and family, and fed them on the "abundance of Egypt." And Israel increased so rapidly, that the Egyptians said: "The children of Israel are more and mightier than we." Was there no providence

in all this? Verily there was. And what was its import? We are not bound to explain it. Our object was merely to bring out the fact, though we should not be able to explain. It is a part of the sacred history, that the increase of the Israelites was so great that a wicked king resolved to destroy their children, as the only way of extirpating them.

But not only was there an unparalleled increase, resulting from the "fatness of the land," and a genial climate, but true religion and the power and majesty of Israel's God were brought into competition with the degrading idolatry of the Egyptians, and their bestial gods; and, as might have been expected, Israel's God triumphed gloriously. The conclusion, then, is, that the providence of God ordained the sojourn in Egypt, and that he meant it for good, both to Israel and to Egypt, and to contiguous nations—good to the Israelites, that they might "save much people alive;" to the Egyptians, that they might gain a knowledge of the living God; good to the nations around, that they might learn to fear and reverence Israel's God. But those Theban Egyptians, who "knew not Joseph," nor his God, though introduced to him by the plagues of Egypt, were overwhelmed in the midst of the sea.

---

---

ART. III.—The "Eternal Now."

SOME ten years ago I read the pamphlet of the distinguished Dr. Porter, in which he founds his chief argument against the Calvinistic views of foreknowledge and decrees upon the mode of the divine thought, in which, he says, there is an *eternal now*. Since then, I have observed that the argument is quite hackneyed, and always based upon the *assumption* of the premise—an eternal now. I confess that for years I could see no force in the oft-repeated arguments of this character. I find others in the same situation. They not only regard the premise as merely assumed, but as insufficient ground on which to meet the whole subject. Some reject the premise as perhaps untrue, or, at best, unintelligible. If it



is neither self-evident nor demonstrable, arguments founded upon it can have no force except to weaken the cause in which they are employed. I may be indulged, therefore, in giving my thoughts, for the first time in any form, on this subject so vital to the interests of truth.

A careful analysis shows the expression to be self-contradictory in any known acceptation of the term *now*. Eternal, meaning without end or limit, cannot, without absurdity, qualify *now*, which is necessarily limited in any of its actual meanings, and, in its strictest sense, is confined to a point of time—a moment. The expression is tantamount to an *unlimited limited* portion of duration. It is of no force to say there is a true idea connected with the expression, which is inadequate, owing to the poverty of language. It is to be feared that much is attributed to poverty of language which really belongs to the account of poverty of idea. A great truth, in fact, underlies the expression, as is the case with every important erroneous expression. The error is fatal to the true idea intended, and is of a twofold character. First, there is but a *partial* conception of the truth, which is presented for the whole truth. That a part is equal to the whole, in whatever form expressed or implied, is self-contradictory, and, therefore, absurd. Secondly, the phrase seeks to express to the comprehension that which can be construed only to the conception. Such everywhere is the Infinite. Reason may affirm its existence, and, in its processes, use it; but we can neither comprehend it nor found our reasonings on its comprehension. Most of our errors, in speaking and reasoning about the Infinite, are referable to one or the other of these kinds. In our eagerness to understand the whole truth, we put the part, which alone we can comprehend, for the whole, and seek to construe to finite understanding what is comprehensible only to the Infinite mind. That these errors are both involved in the expression will appear from the following considerations:

The notion of *now*, the present time, is correlated to those of past and future. The term can have no conceivable meaning like that which it now has, unless its correlatives are understood. Without the ideas of past and of future, that of now could no more exist than could the idea of son without a

father, or of effect without a cause. To assert, therefore, that, in the mode of the divine thought there is no past nor future, necessitates the conclusion that with him there is no present, as in our mode of thought. The negation is only a part of the whole truth; hence the error in the expression founded upon it; and the Calvinist, against whom one may argue, can show that there is as great absurdity in applying to the mode of the divine thought the term *now*, as the term past or the term future. Nay, more; he can show that the *eternal now* in the mind of Deity is more absurd than past, present, and future. The former attributes to him the human mode mutilated and distorted; the latter, entire and consistent. Both present self-contradictions which can be removed only by assuming that, in the mode of the divine thought, there is neither past nor future, and that with Deity there is no now, as in our comprehension. Why not say at once that he thinks not in the past, present, and future as we do, instead of using language which can be self-consistent only when explained to mean this? But is this true? Is it either self-evident or demonstrable? The infinite, absolute, and omniscient mind being given, then its modes of thought must embrace eternity, without any past, present, or future. It must be so, and cannot be otherwise without self-contradiction and absurdity. Such are the characteristics of self-evident propositions. No argument can make them plainer than the bare statement. We may, however, show the contradictions that will arise on any other supposition.

It is absurd to speak of a past or a future eternity. The very terms imply limitation. The past had no beginning; but it already has an ending. The future never will end; but it is never without a beginning. Remove the ending from the one, and the beginning from the other, and they become synonymous terms, both being synonymous with eternity. Doubly absurd is it to speak of an eternal *now*, since the *now* is necessarily limited on both sides. When we extend its definition beyond these limits, it ceases to be our now; and, as we cannot fix other limits without involving the same absurdities as in the use of the word in the strictest sense, we must leave it without limit when applied to the thoughts of



Deity. The expression, then, is equivalent to an *eternal eternity*, a redundancy which expresses no more than the term eternity. To say, therefore, that with God is an eternal now, is no more nor less than to say with him is eternity. The latter is unambiguous and presents no self-contradiction. The former is ambiguous at best, and full of contradiction on any supposition which does not make it synonymous with the latter. Neither expression can bring the idea within the mind's comprehension. This effort to construe the Infinite to the finite mind is a species of the most subtle self-deception; for when we have used terms within our comprehension, we have fallen short of the expression of the Infinite. Reason affirms that infinity does, and *must*, exist in certain things; but we can comprehend it in no case. It affirms that there must be eternity; but our minds cannot grasp, in one view, the whole of eternity. It is not condensable to now. Reason affirms that the mind of the Omniscient must embrace eternity as perfectly and distinctly as our minds embrace, in their modes, a moment. On any other supposition God cannot be affirmed to be omniscient. Yet "who hath known the mind of the Lord," or fathomed the depths of eternity?

Having approached the subject from the side of the Infinite and the Absolute, let us view it from the stand-point of the Finite. "My thoughts are not as your thoughts." Does reason confirm this declaration of inspiration? How does the finite mind approach the idea of duration? Does it start with eternity, and, by divisions and subdivisions, reach a point—the now? or does its first thought of duration originate with a limited, comprehensible portion of time? Sound philosophy tells us that, in every case, the Finite and the Conditioned is the chronological antecedent of the Infinite and the Unconditioned. In the case before us we find that the chronological antecedent of the idea of duration is that of succession. Now, does succession, such as we can comprehend, suggest first infinite or finite duration? Evidently finite first. Succession once perceived, reason affirms there must be duration, and then that it must be infinite. These are scientific truths, deduced from well-known phenomena of mind.

We know of no finite portion of duration that is not lim-

ited and measured by some artificial or natural periodic succession, which is in every case limited. There is no other way known by which to define time than by such successions as mark periods and epochs. Without some such chronometers, our minds, as at present constituted, would take no cognizance of duration, either as finite or infinite, as past, present, or future. Eternity would be before the mind with neither beginning nor ending, furnishing no possible chronological antecedent to reason which alone can affirm duration as infinite. Eternity has no dial-plate. It cannot be measured by *eons of eons*, though these are far beyond our comprehension. Without something, therefore, to express duration to the finite mind, we would take no cognizance of it in our modes of thought. This is not only true, but it must be so, on the condition of our finite being. In such a being the Infinite cannot be a chronological antecedent in the beginnings of knowledge. The Infinite is an idea of pure reason; but finite reason can affirm the Infinite only on some antecedent idea necessarily implying the Infinite. For a like reason the ideas of body and its necessary extension must exist in the mind before reason can affirm space as finite or infinite. One cannot but have observed the close analogies between space and duration, and how many terms used to define time are borrowed from the vocabulary of space. This is not only so with the *terms*, but with the *relations* of time and metaphysical ideas in general. Nearly all the principles of syntax in the classical languages have their primary origin in local relations. This usage extends back to the Sanscrit, the fountain-head of classical language. The Sanscrit locative case is used also to express time when, and is merged into the Greek dative of time and place, and the Latin ablative of the same. Examples need not be multiplied. Language is the spontaneous expression of thought. It necessarily involves the modes and laws of thought. Such are the intimate relations of space and time to our modes of thought that we cannot frame a single sentence without involving one or both of them. The reason of all this is in our finite natures. We need a before, a here, and a behind; a left, a here, and a right; an above, a here, and a below; because any considerable

extent of space must pass under our view in successive parts. This is true both of the eye and the mind, and for the very same reasons. If we could grasp the whole view at once, we could distinguish and classify all the parts more perfectly than we do in our present mode; but there would be no succession of ideas in such a view. The view would be simultaneous, as regards both space and time. So with a succession of events. We are conscious of a lapse of time, because we cannot see the end from the beginning. It is a necessary conclusion, therefore, that he that sees the end from the beginning has a mode of thought independent of duration. Duration is not, and cannot be, a condition to such a mode of thought. Such condition can be affirmed only of the finite, conditioned nature, and can be applied to the unconditioned, absolute mind only with infinite absurdity. But in this view of the subject we find it most difficult to distinguish between the mode of our thoughts and that of the divine thoughts. Said a doctor of divinity, the other day: "Ah, I cannot believe it; because God must see things as they are, and we know there are successions both of time and events." The difficulty, on a superficial view, seems insuperable; but it entirely disappears, if we stick close to the text, "My thoughts are not as your thoughts." We must distinguish between *what* he knows and *how* he knows, between the thing known and the mode of knowing it. Neither this text nor the preceding reasoning teaches that God has no knowledge of the successions of time and events; but, among other things, it is meant that they do not pass in succession in his mind as in ours. He sees the end from the beginning, and comprehends all events and duration in one view. One thought need not pass out of his mind that another may enter; he does not withdraw from one landscape to view another, as we must do. Yet this does not hinder him from viewing each and all as they actually exist. Nay, more, this is the only condition upon which we can affirm that he does know all things perfectly. The eyes of the Lord are in every place beholding the evil and the good. As well talk of an infinite *here* as of an eternal now. The absurdity of the one cannot be any greater than that of the other. He that is everywhere present, also "inhabiteth eternity."

But this proposition, when relieved of all cumbrance from partial and erroneous expression, is itself only a part of the premise which we need to expose Calvinistic errors. Furthermore, we must distinguish between our mode of thought and that of Deity, in this: our minds, being finite and conditioned, must have beginnings of knowledge, and these beginnings must be with finite things. The theory of innate ideas has long since been exploded. Reason cannot affirm the first idea, until the chronological antecedent is given. This is, in every case, finite, conditioned, dependent. Body is finite, and conditioned on space. Without space, body could not exist. Space, by reason of this connection, stands in the relation of logical antecedent to body; therefore, body being given, reason affirms space, and affirms that it must be infinite. Thus the way is opened for our progress in knowledge in two ways. By the primary faculties we may accumulate ideas which the secondary faculties combine into multiplied notions. We can also go from the less to the greater, from the finite to the infinite. These are laws of thought which it is absurd to attribute to the infinite, omniscient mind. There can be in such a mind no progress in knowledge in either of these ways. But embracing directly and entire the Infinite, it embraces necessarily and entirely all realities and possibilities conditioned on the Infinite. This is not only so, but it *must* be so. The Unconditioned and Absolute alone are eternal. All things dependent and conditioned had a beginning. There was a time, then, when they did not exist. Before they began to be, they could be viewed only through their logical antecedents as possibilities; but, as they are dependent upon and determined by the Absolute, their becoming realities adds no new knowledge to the divine mind. Deity models every thing after his perfect *idea*, and not his idea from the thing made or done. A logical antecedent cannot be perfectly known without a knowledge of all possibilities and realities connected with it. This idea, along with the one that God "inhabiteth eternity," exposes the anthropomorphism of the Calvinistic views of foreknowledge as related to decrees.

In like manner our knowledge proceeds from effect to

cause, while the Divine mind must know the effect in the cause. This is evident from many considerations. Every student of mechanics knows that forces are measured and designated by the quantity of work they can perform, or the velocity they can impart in a given time; that is, the cause is estimated from the effect. This is the only way by which we can estimate the intensity and determine the laws of any causative force. But after we have thus ascertained the laws of its action, we may predict the effect from the cause. We can study and know the effect from the cause, so long as the cause is known and within our comprehension. Abundant examples of this procedure are found in all the well-tested forces. The machinist can tell the number of horsepower of the engine before it is tested; the engineer can tell just how much fuel will develop and sustain that power for a given time; and the mechanic can estimate its quantity of work. When a gun of given weight and caliber has been tested, cartridges can be made by the thousand for a given range and effect. If man, then, may and does know effects in their causes, must not Deity know all effects in their causes? But, more, can we be said to *know* a cause; none of whose effective powers and laws are known to us? The assertion would be absurd. Neither can Deity know any cause perfectly without knowing all its laws and possible effects. It is a necessary truth, then, that the Omniscient knows all effects in their causes. But this rests, if possible, on still higher grounds. All admit that God is the ultimate, self-conscious cause of all things. To say that he is self-conscious of his powers, is but to say that he knows absolutely within himself all possible and real effects of his power. Any other supposition would reduce Deity to the necessity of experimenting before he could have a knowledge of himself.

Again, our mental process is from the individual to the species, from species to genera, and so on. Every step in this direction enlarges our understanding, until we can, at last, dispose of and wield a vast field of knowledge, and make it subservient to yet higher purposes. Among thousands of examples may be mentioned the discovery of the laws of universal gravitation and those of electricity. The first

put into man's hand a balance with which to weigh the spheres, and a power of computation with which to locate yet unseen planets. By the latter, he not only explains many phenomena of Nature, and discovers the "secret places of thunder," but sends his own thoughts echoing through the silent chambers of the deep, outstripping time and annihilating space. Such being the law of thought, reason affirms that the mind which embraces the infinite, the absolute, and the universal truth, must know all things in this. There are ultimate principles of pure science, known to us, on which we know rests the harmony of the spheres, of proportions, and of colors. Can reason but affirm that in the universal principles known to the Deity rest all the combined harmonies of the universe? The philosopher well said: "God geometrizes in framing the universe." If man can arise to the conception of a universal *cosmos*, must not Deity comprehend it in his infinite thought? His harmonious handiworks are but sensible embodiments, partial concrete expressions of the divine ideal. Sense takes cognizance of the physical object, giving the chronological antecedent of the idea of pure reason, which always connects with some feature of the Infinite and the Universal. Thus are we correlated to both mixed and pure science on the side of the Infinite; but God is correlated to them on the side of the Infinite. Well may he say, then, "As the heavens are high above the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

But there is yet a deeper glance at the divine original, whose faint image we bear. It is a fact of universal consciousness that our highest and purest happiness flows from the exercise of the ideal faculties. No harmony was ever contemplated but that the mind framed in its own idea one more perfect. The touch of the string of the instrument but gives the lower notes in the scale by which the mind ascends to notes ineffable. Instrumental harmony but gives the imagination wings, to bear the soul away to boundless fields of ideal harmony. The skeptical poet has falsely said:

"The diapason closes full in man."



Working after his own ideal, he creates fairer forms than his. He as easily and more frequently creates ideal minds more lofty and pure than his own, and fills them with ideal wonders and pleasures. In the ideal ecstasy of his soul he exclaims:

Burst, ye emerald gates, and bring  
To my raptured vision,  
All the ecstatic joys that spring  
'Round the bright Elysian.

As the river and trees of life, the gold-paved streets, and the pure white throne burst upon his view, he sings with transport:

Filled with delight, my raptur'd soul,  
Would here no longer stay;  
Though Jordan's waves around me roll,  
Fearless I launch away.

Thus millions have not only sung the transport of ideal bliss, but, "soothed and sustained by an unfaltering trust" that what is now ideal hope will soon be consummated in fruition, have triumphed over the king of terrors and left the world with joy. Many are the paths of the mind. All except those of sin and error lead up to Him whose perfections surpass all our ideas and ideals, in whose "presence is fullness of joy, and at whose right hand are pleasures forevermore."

These are the most exalted faculties of our being. They must bear the strongest impress of the divine image. Whence, then, can arise the infinite blessedness of Deity, but from the contemplation of the universe in his own all-perfect idea? His idea being perfect, he has within himself the fountains of blessedness, both for himself and all intelligent creatures. Thus, in whatever way we view the subject, we verify his faithful word, "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

To be consistent, therefore, we must leave out of our premise every expression capable of such interpretation as will attribute to Deity such modes of thought as belong to us and



arise out of our essential constitution. For this reason the "eternal now" should be left out of our vocabulary. The Calvinistic errors are founded on the absurdity of attributing to Deity human modes of thought. We cannot expose these errors while our premise contains a greater absurdity than their own. We have the scriptural idea. Why not use the scripture language of Him who "inhabiteth eternity," with whom "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

It was intended, in the outset of this article, to view the foundations only. We have seen that they are exceedingly broad and deeply laid, being established in self-evident, necessary truth. They are valid, and we may build thereon with the utmost confidence.

---

---

#### ART. IV.—*Practical Theology.*

THEOLOGY is that grand and sublime science that considers the existence and character of God, as he reveals himself in creation, redemption, and providence. For its complete definition and history, we cannot do better than refer the reader to the first volume of Dr. Beard's invaluable work which will hold an honored place among the books of the world centuries hence.

The whole subject of theology is most appropriately divided into two departments—namely, systematic and practical. Systematic theology is a science. It arranges and classifies the attributes and prerogatives of the Divine Being, and also the manifold relations which he sustains to all created things. It is the philosophy of divinity and its revelations. Practical theology is the high and sacred art of expounding, demonstrating, enforcing, and applying the great theories of systematic theology. It is a very different but no less important sphere. The relation these departments sustain to each other is most intimate and interesting; and, though distinct, they are inseparable. The first requires a teacher, a professor, a philos-

opher; the second demands a meek, but brave, evangel, an untiring and executive pastor, a dauntless and consecrated preacher. The first may perform his work in the cloister, in the quiet retreats of meditation and reflection; but the second must go out into the "highways and hedges," and to the ends of the earth; he must preach from house to house; he must meet the multitudes upon the mountain and down at the seaside. A theologian *may* be a preacher, but every preacher *must* be a theologian. A man may have his head full of theological lore and theory, but be destitute of practical ability; another may have good practical ability, but know nothing scarcely to practice. The first may be more respectable than the second, but they are alike helpless and inefficient. How to gain both of these points, and in the shortest time, is the great question to be answered.

Practical theology may be divided into three departments, and will be considered here in the following order: 1. Evangelical. 2. Pastoral. 3. Homiletical. The evangelist, the pastor, and the homilist will claim our attention as the natural occupants of the entire field of the Christian ministry. Most writers discuss this subject under the heads of homiletics and pastoral theology. Preference is given here to the simple and general head, practical theology, subdivided as above; and the reasons for this will be given as the discussion proceeds.

In the first place, the most serious attention of the candidate for the ministry is invited to the nature of the work to be done—the work of the gospel ministry. When this is fully comprehended, it is not difficult to understand what is needed to fit the workman for his field. It is also easy to see what he needs most—that which he should seek first to obtain. He cannot gain all that is requisite in the same way, nor all at the same time. Out of the great number of young men who enter the ministry, there is not more than one of twenty that passes his life as a happy and successful preacher. The great majority of them may still bear the name; but they struggle along, far in the rear, even of their own expectations. As the poor Jews are dispersed among the nations, so are these Christian preachers, seeking a living among the various avo-

cations of the world. The Church of our time stands forth resolutely claiming the respect and confidence of mankind, and yet it is most seriously impeded by its ministry. The few young men among us who can be induced to attend our colleges, and receive the aid of the Church, are often, soon after their graduation, absorbed by the world. When we call for them, they do not answer, and when we seek for them, they cannot be found. Multitudes of others are licensed and ordained; but, after a very temporary effort—such as would accomplish nothing in any other pursuit—they turn away, and are never heard of, unless it is to complain of neglect, or of a want on the part of the Church to appreciate the gospel.

Now, this state of things is no exception in philosophy, and there is a just and simple reason for every such case. It is proposed to find this reason; and it is to be sought first in the hasty survey, on the part of the candidate, of the work to be done. He may not have comprehended its extent and magnitude. His view may have been hasty, partial, perhaps carnal. There are to-day many men who have been trying to preach for years, but who have not the first true conception of the work. Not knowing it themselves, how can they teach others to see it? They are blind leaders of the blind; and that is the reason why both fall into the ditch. No part of practical theology is more profoundly solemn than the induction of the candidate into the ministry. The man who has a just conception of the work of the ministry will either enter upon it and succeed, or he will not enter upon it at all. It is not clothed with danger and terror, that any need fear to gaze long and intently upon it. It is the privilege and the duty of all Christians to contemplate its indescribable grandeur and glory. The ministry—it is the wonder of wonders in the mysterious kingdom of God! It is the post of honor next to Christ on the right hand of the Most High. It cannot be contemplated from the common walks of men; one must get above the fogs and obscuring clouds of sense by ascending the mount with Peter, and James, and John, to join Moses and Elias, where the divine glory is indeed visible, and where there will be no need even of a tabernacle to dwell in. From thence we would say to the young candidate, Look down on

the living issues of this wondrous ministry, and behold the men of God as they go forth among the people, as flames of purifying fire, bringing life and immortality to light, and filling eternity with the results of human redemption. Follow you earthly evangel through the good fight of faith, and see him lay hold on eternal life, and pass on to his reward. Watch that good shepherd as he lays down his life for the sheep, and departs to be with Christ. Behold that homilist that stands solitary and alone on the Athenian hill, and makes a nation of philosophers tremble before his resurrection scene. When you have gazed long and prayerfully on this gospel field, and then heard the promise of your glorified Redeemer, to be with you always, ask if you have a mind to this work, and then decide it once for all. Take wealth, honor, pleasure, home, and friends—ay, all that the world calls great and good—and weigh them fairly against poverty, persecution, hardship, toil, and the salvation of one soul, and make your choice. If you decide to enter upon this work, let that end the matter thus far.

In the second place, the qualifications requisite are to be considered, and these will be taken up in their order.

I. Consecration to God—piety—godliness. This greatest of all qualifications need not, like some others, require the labor and toil of years to gain. Much may be done in a very short time; for it is a work of grace, and always succeeds a thorough surrender of ourselves to the will and ways of God. It is not merely the present consent of our hearts to love him and obey his behests, but a cheerful, hearty, and unconditional surrendering to him of our hearts, our minds, our powers, our time, our means. This consecration enables us always to say: 1. I want to be just what God wants me to be. 2. I want to do only what he wants me to do. 3. I want to have no more nor less than he wants me to have. To gain this attainment is to occupy the loftiest summit of human excellence. The sunlight of God's approbation forever rests upon it; and whoever attains thereto is obliged to be happy. To him all places and situations are alike. He is above trouble, vexation, and fear. His ways are wise and pleasant, because ordered of the Lord. His work is delightful, and his reward is sure. His

whole life, nay, every moment, is a divine harmony—an acceptable anthem of pure worship. That there are degrees in this consecration, is certainly true, and blessed is the man who early reaches the highest; for he will have great power with God, and God will give him great power with man. Whoever attains to this complete consecration, has that within himself which will sanctify and consecrate all other means and every facility for usefulness. If he is gifted with great talents, he will make them gain other great talents. If he should become the possessor of wealth, he will take it with him to the house of God, and baptize it in Christ's name. He will see God everywhere, and in every thing. He will look upon the things of the world as temporal conveniences, simply to serve their purpose in assisting him to glorify God. As the traveler who stops for a moment at the cool gushing spring, slakes his thirst, refreshes himself beneath the broad old tree, and, strengthened thereby, presses on in his journey, so the consecrated man enjoys, and then without regret leaves behind him, the fairest allurements of the world. To him they are bright and beautiful, but by no means the goal of his life. He will glory in tribulation, also, knowing that it will work patience, and patience experience. No man is fit to preach the gospel while wedded to the world. Nothing but genuine consecration to God can divorce him from it. There will be a fierce and perpetual conflict within his own heart; and this, of course, will retard every movement and becloud every effort of his mind. Every thing in the gospel is heavenly and eternal, pure and spiritual, and cannot alloy with the earthly and carnal, the sensual and temporal. Great consecration to God never fails of success; and its place can be supplied by nothing else. Most suitable is it to all Christian effort, but most indispensable to the minister of Christ. It is the great want of the day. It was this that gave luster to the lives of the martyrs, and it will do for us what it did for them, if we will seek it first of all, and seek until we attain to it.

We have men in the ministry to-day who, if consecrated to God fully, would shake a continent with their power; but how can they while their locks are woven fast in the loom of Philistia? We have old men whose broad shadow ought to

reach across two generations, but they are toiling early and late at the wheel of Gaza, strong but blind. We may build colleges and schools in every city and town in our wide and glorious domain, pile our shelves with the books of most wise and learned authors, and drain the Church of its wealth to send missionaries with the gospel to the destitute, but it may all be of no avail. One day at the foot of the cross is worth it all. To prove all this, we have only to look back upon the history of the Church. When one or two centuries of human contrivances and substitutes have put the Church to sleep, we see a sudden and mighty upheaval. Old and strong principalities of formalism and infidelity tumble into ruin, and the head of the great serpent lies bleeding beneath the bruising heel of Messiah. When we seek for the instrumentality, we shall always find a few consecrated servants of God carrying forward this mighty work; and one such demonstration is enough to settle this question. We would not be understood as in any way ignoring any and all other needful helps, because we insist upon an absolute supremacy for this one. They are many and needful, as we shall hereafter attempt to prove; but this is indispensable. They are second; this is first. Consecration to God, without human learning, is a mighty power of itself. Learning, talents, and emoluments, without consecration, are but sounding brass and tinkling cymbals; but taken together, and in the order here indicated, they are the Pauline attire and panoply of the gospel ministry.

Again, this prime element of the ministry is an appropriating quality. It marshals all the host of material, sets it in order, and puts it to work. It gives a tongue of vast praise to the roaring ocean, and calls upon the lily and the sparrow to glorify God. While it binds a faithful and loving John to its breast, it prays for poor, cursing Peter, while Satan was trying to sift him as wheat. It is a frugal power, saving all useful instrumentality, and losing none; for what it cannot conquer with a thunderbolt it may subdue with a tear. Its fan is in its hand, and it thoroughly purges its floor, gathering the wheat into the garner, and burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire. Its wars are incessant, and its victories sure and complete. Its only weapon is the sword of the



Spirit, which is wielded only in the name of the Prince of Peace. Its career is triumphant and glorious, and its guerdon is the saints' everlasting rest. Although this great qualification is essential to success in every department of the wide field of theology, it is especially so to the practical theologian, whose daily walk is beneath the gaze of the public eye; and it is now proposed to inquire briefly how it may be gained.

1. It is an exercise of the closet, where the door is shut and we are alone with God; where the light of eternal truth may shine into our hearts. The process is simple, but humiliating and severe, and consists in but three things: honest and thorough personal examination, resolute and persistent self-denial, and earnest prayer, with a view to this one end.

2. Our walk must be with God. This is but little understood or practiced by many who enter upon the great work. They do not realize that God is with them all the time, and will direct every step. They can pray for the conversion of sinners, for their salvation, for health and strength, for protection in times of danger; but they do not ask him for the little things of life. They do not seem to think that they are just as dependent on him for a drink of water or a morsel of bread as they are for the sweet rest of heaven.

3. We must look for, and constantly try to place a proper estimate upon, Christian work, and seek pleasure in duty. All duties are God's great work, and the greatest privilege we enjoy is to be allowed to do any of them. We have gained much when we have reached that point where the discharge of our duties forms the chief delight of our hearts.

II. Consecration to the work of the ministry. This is the next great point to be gained by the candidate. It is sometimes said by ministers that a sense of duty alone impels them to this sacred office. Such a plea, it is true, is much better than to decline; but the work then is a joyless mission. It ought to be one's choice above all other occupations. It should be his meat and drink to minister for Christ, so that he would gladly choose poverty and hardships, suffering and shame, with this office, rather than honor, wealth, distinction, and ease in any other. Let him separate it, examine each part of it, and see that he is pleased with it all. It has its seasons



of unspeakable joy, and its hours of bitter sorrow; its days of brightness, and its nights of gloom; its hardness and buffetings, as well as applause and caresses. Let him ascertain why he loves this work. Is it because it is a noble and influential profession, affording a leading position among men, or is it because it saves sinners from the woes of sin, and raises them up to a knowledge of God in Christ? Is it because it puts him in a line with Christ in the great work of human redemption? The former are all true, and may be coveted by the carnal mind; but the latter, together with the former, represents the ministry of Christ.

Consecration to this work does not fail to embrace the idea that the workman must live while he works; and he must live of the gospel. The Bible does not describe this living, nor define what kind it is to be. Will the candidate carefully examine this matter as to whether he will be content and satisfied with this living? It may be very good or very poor according to the judgment of the world; but will he accept it cheerfully, and look to no other source? Paul worked with his own hands for a short time; but it was not after his labors had had time to yield their fruit. Christ not only secured his support from those who received his ministry, but he supported his twelve also while they were with him. This living succeeds the office, not the office the living. If any man will enter upon this work, he must enter upon its living also; otherwise, while he is gone elsewhere after the living, the work will suffer and the office be dishonored. Entire consecration to the work, and to the whole work, has no fear for the want of bread, and need have none. The Church mourns when the Christian pulpit lusts after the world; and Zion should fast and pray that no such applicant should approach her gates. His very breath will taint her sanctuary and bring pestilence upon the people.

If these two indispensable qualifications, consecration to God and to his work, are gained, we will strive to attain to other and very important ones. And it is in place here to mark out the way in which they may most easily and successfully be obtained. Three things are needed: education, knowledge, and experience. As they are inseparable in use,

they must be obtained together, and at the same time. To think, to know, and to practice, is the whole code of successful execution. Practical theology is by no means an exception to this universal rule. To be educated, is to be able to think correctly, rapidly, systematically, and profoundly; and no human employment requires this ability more than does the Christian ministry. To offer an argument here in support of this truth would be quite useless, if not offensive to an intelligent reader. Knowledge is the personal understanding and possession of truth and facts. We may be well educated and still not have much knowledge, or we may be quite intelligent and yet not well educated. Education enables us to accumulate knowledge, and knowledge will enable us to illustrate, convey, and enforce our thoughts. But what will it avail to the preacher to think well and know much, if he cannot impart it to others. He may, and should, write well; but he is not an essayist. He is professionally a talker, a speaker, and should be, if possible, the best of speakers; his eloquence should be equal and honorable to his theme and mission. He must know what to say, and how to say it. This requires assiduous study and careful practice. The pulpit is not the place, nor is the gospel the theme, either for blundering awkwardness or blatant ignorance. The sermon and its delivery should be equal to the importance of the occasion and the momentous results contemplated. No time, place, nor effort is comparable to such fearful responsibility.

To prepare for and meet the solemn issue, a position is here taken which many, perhaps, will controvert; still, it is assumed boldly, and most sincerely. When the candidate, consecrated to God and to this holy calling, commences his school-course, he should be licensed and set to work as he can find opportunity. He is a learner; give him liberty that he may learn. Let him try, and keep trying; he is not a preacher, but he is learning to preach. Let his practice keep pace with his theory. Let his Bible be his first and greatest text-book, and be studied closely with the sciences and classics. What is a law-school without a moot-court? a medical college without a clinic? It may be urged that he must first finish his course, and then he may begin to preach intel-

ligerly. In answer to this it may be said that he is not expected at first to be an able expounder, nor does it require a philosopher to tell sinners that Christ died for them. The gospel has its elementary lessons as well as its stupendous mysteries. Teach the candidate to begin at the beginning, and review often and carefully. It will be objected that he is required to both read and preach before his learned and critical professor during his theological course. That is right, and we would not change it in any way; but, in the first place, he is too late beginning; his practice is far in the rear of his education; his intellect has outstripped his heart; his warm zeal is consumed by sharp criticism. He ought by this time, if need be, to have traveled a thousand miles on foot, and should have preached many times to all the little destitute churches within his reach. He might have been perfectly familiar with the prayer-meeting and the Sabbath school work. In the second place, preaching in the professor's room is too cold and uninspiring; the audience is set for criticism. The motive is good, but it is single, and looks only to mental cultivation. It does not reach out after a lost sinner, and yearn for the salvation of a soul. It is a very learned, trim, well-seasoned little sermon, and perhaps as good as the professor himself could preach, under the circumstances; but the performance was simply to train; it was not intended either to edify, instruct, or to save anybody; and, these motives all wanting, how could he learn to preach in demonstration and power? We shall all do enough of that kind of preaching without special training. We do not believe any man is prepared to assume the responsibilities of a pastor, until he has had experience as an evangelist; and, therefore, we would license the freshman to preach to sinners, and insist upon his doing it, as well as to preach to his teacher and class-mates. The apostles were all evangelists before they were pastors. Paul was a great teacher of practical, as well as systematic, theology; and he took Timothy with him on his terrible circuit, and seriously reprimanded John Mark, because he turned back and would not go. We would counsel every young man—no matter how many diplomas he may have, and the more the better—if he has not had a good experience in

preaching to congregations while at college, to spend at least one year on the circuit as an evangelist, before he attempts to take charge of a church as a pastor. And we will proceed to assign good and sufficient reasons, we think, for this counsel.

1. The college life is necessarily one of more or less seclusion from society, and the student is not, of course, in sympathy with the masses with whom he must associate as a pastor. The transition is too great to be made suddenly; and an effort to transfer the mode of life and set habits of the college to the miscellaneous walks of active, pastoral life, is obliged to result in failure. His head is full of theories, many of which are erroneous and will not stand the friction of life. The pastor, as will be seen hereafter, must be eminently a social man; not one who engages in the light fripperies of fashionable life, but a sober, discreet, genial gentleman, to whom all may, with safety, refer—one who commands the respect of the intelligent and influential, and, at the same time, whose daily walk is with the humble and lowly. He must be master of that "all things to all men," that he may win some.

2. He is to exemplify that peculiar principle of the gospel that will cause those who are unaccustomed to give, and with whom he daily associates, to yield to him a support, and that without compulsion; and this he can do much more easily where the field is wider, his expenses less, and his associations less frequent.

3. There is hardship for every good soldier of Jesus Christ, and the sooner he learns to endure it the better. There is no such field as that which lies out before the evangel to the destitute and waste places in Zion. While privation and hardship will humble and chasten his own ambitious dreams, the gladness with which the poor will receive his gospel will make him zealous, humble, and resolute in his calling. No man knows the bliss of preaching, until he enjoys the welcome which only the destitute can give the faithful evangelist as he goes round on his mission of labor and love.

4. The pastor must appear all the time before the same hearers, and interest them at each meeting. He must come constantly in competition with men of experience; must open

the way for new aggressions by visitations; must bear his part in the gratuitous services required of public men, or suffer in his influence if he should decline; and this will leave him but little time for that peculiar meditation that gives edge and power to a sermon. No man has a better opportunity for secret communion with God, nor feels more devoted to him than the young evangelist on his long, tiresome, and lonely ride to those who are hungry and waiting for his precious consolations. His are not delicate, sickly, and surfeited hearers, with itching ears that will be pained at the faithful address of the gospel.

5. After all the study of books and attention to instructive lectures, preaching is learned only by experience. These advantages aid much; but nothing can supply the place of experience. This is a stubborn and unyielding truth. The only question then is, Which of these branches is best adapted to the beginner? We appeal first to the Bible, and then to every avocation and profession in practical life. And shall the ministry be the only exception to the rule among them all? The call is from God, and the authority is given by the laying on of hands; but the ability is the result of due and careful preparation and experience. Most professors of pastoral theology never were successful pastors; and the smallest number of them were ever evangelists for any considerable time. They may dissent from these views; but they are not to be regarded as the most competent judges. Let the decision be left to those who are to-day in the work of pastoral life, and who are familiar with the work of the evangelist.

In conclusion, here is the fatal *Avernus* that has engulfed so many young men who were once the precious hope of the Church for its ministry. It consists in but three things: 1. Want of consecration to God. 2. Want of consecration to this sacred work. 3. A wrong start in ministerial life. Any one of these is amply sufficient to wreck the young preacher; and certain overthrow awaits him who drifts upon them all. To avoid the first and second, he must settle it early and well before the expectations of the Church settle upon him. The third is quite within his control. As he leaves college let him remember, first of all, that he, although a scholar, licensed

and ordained, is not a preacher yet, but only an *entered apprentice*. Now, let him determine to be a workman first, and demand a workman's wages. Let him take hold of some plain piece of work, not above his present skill, and work patiently, carefully, and earnestly; and, if he succeeds, the Master will pay him his wages and promote him in due time. Let him determine to live of the gospel, and this will be a test of his workmanship. Let him begin at the ground, and attempt not at first to work on a high scaffold; they who are there ascended gradually. It may be too high for a young man, and, if he becomes dizzy and falls, he would land in that dreadful Golgotha already white with the bleaching bones of aspiring ecclesiastics. It is a college phrase, "Let your aims be high," and it is right; but it is a Bible saying that a man ought "not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think," and "he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

---

ART. V.—*The Abrahamic Covenant.*

THE sacred writers use the term "covenant" with a variety of significations. In Jeremiah xxxiii. 20, it is, by synecdoche, used both in the sense of ordinance and of promise: "If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night; and that there should not be day and night in their season, then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne." In the above, direct reference is made to the divine ordination of the seasons, and of the alternation of day and night, as established in Genesis viii. 22, "While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night shall not cease;" also to the *promise* made to David for the perpetuity of his throne. In Exodus xxxiv. 10, the promise to expel the Canaanites and give their land to the Hebrews, is denominated a covenant: "And he said, Behold, I make a covenant: before all the people I will do marvels, such as have not been done in all the earth,



nor in any nation." In Isaiah lix. 21, the promise of the Spirit is called a covenant: "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever." In Jeremiah xxxiv. 13, 14, a precept is called a covenant: "I made a covenant with your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondmen, saying, At the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother a Hebrew, which hath been sold unto thee." Sometimes it is the synonyme of dispensation or administration, especially when the Jewish economy is contrasted with the Christian. (Hebrews viii. and ix.) The former is denominated the old, and the latter the new, covenant. "In that he saith a *new* covenant, he hath made the first *old*: then seeing the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." Again, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah."

In the Adamic—that of redemption, and the Abrahamic, or covenant of grace, are embraced all the essential characteristics of a formal covenant. Hence the apostle speaks of a plurality of covenants: "To the Israelites pertain the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." Inattention to the foregoing uses of the term has occasioned much perplexity and disputation. Technically, a covenant is an agreement between two or more parties to do, or not to do, certain things. The party of the first part promises to do something, upon the performance of certain stipulations, on antecedent conditions, by the party of the second part; non-performance of these conditions precedent, works a forfeiture of the rights covenanted. The essentials of every proper covenant are: 1. Legal parties. 2. A promise. 3. Conditions. 4. Forfeiture and penalty. 5. A seal by which the whole is usually attested and ratified. Of this class are the covenants of works, of redemption, and of grace. Of the first the par-



ties are God and the race, represented by Adam. The promise is life; the condition is, *do*; the penalty, death. In the second, the parties are God the Father, and God the Son; and in this only is there an equality of the parties. The Father covenants to save, upon the condition that the Son voluntarily assume the likeness of man, and vicariously obey, and suffer the penalty of man's transgressions. Isaiah liii.: "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief. When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." In the covenant of grace, which necessarily arises from that of redemption, salvation is the object covenanted, and the condition is faith on the part of the saved. The penalty of unbelief is a forfeiture of the blessings covenanted. All covenants are either personal, or representative. Of the first class, are those made with individuals only. There is nothing in them obligatory upon, or necessarily beneficial to, their natural or legal representatives. An example is, probably, found in that of the angels. As they "neither marry nor are given in marriage," there can be no *races* of angels; hence, each must have undergone a trial for the individual only; or else must have fallen, or been confirmed, in some pre-Adamite Head. When, however, man was created, a new order of beings was introduced, being neither pure spirit, nor all animal, but a combination of both. The covenant with him was not personal, but representative, the parties to which were God and the race. The blessing promised was life; the condition, obedience; and the penalty of the non-fulfilment of the condition, death. The sacramental seal of this covenant was the "tree of the knowledge of good and of evil." In the covenant of grace, Christ, the promised seed of the woman and the "thy seed" of Abraham, is the real, and as yet invisible, representative of the race, while Abraham was only the nominal and visible head. Hence, the great expounder of the old dispensation says: "And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God (*εις Χριστόν*) unto Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul." Hence

also it is said, "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham."

The three great covenants which pertain to our race are in their nature distinct, though intimately connected. Each constitutes the basis of its successor. Each is a unit. The Adamic is one; the promise, the condition, the seal, and the penalty, are all single. So with the covenant of redemption; so with the Abrahamic, or covenant of grace. All its essential features are one and the same, "yesterday, to-day, and forever;" *the form* of the seal, but not the seal itself, or its sacred import, being alone changed. Hence the Scriptures recognize only *one covenant* with Abraham. Nowhere do they speak of *covenants* with him, for there can be but one covenant of grace. The first annunciation of the covenant of grace is found in the promise, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head;" and its first sensible embodiment is exhibited in the symbols and teaching ordinances then introduced. Afterward, midway between Adam and Christ, it is renewed, and more specially expressed to Abraham, with the addition of such *incidental* circumstances as were necessary to its earthly development, such as the promise of a numerous posterity, and the gift of the land of Canaan. These were only incidental to the fulfillment of the covenant, and therefore formed no essential part thereof. The constitution of the United States specifies certain powers granted to the general government by the States in convention, but reserves to the sovereign States all powers not therein specially delegated, *nor necessary to the execution of the powers delegated*. The powers expressly delegated make the constitution; those necessary to the execution of its provisions are only incidental, subsidiary, and subordinate. Grace is the ground idea of the Abrahamic covenant. Salvation through the suffering, but conquering, "seed of the woman," and of "thy seed," is the Magna Charta of the Church. Yet, inasmuch as the "fullness of the times" had not arrived, a nationality, in which the Messianic line of descent should be preserved, was necessary; this nation must have a dwelling-place, for the observance of the symbols and rites of the covenant, until Shiloh should come; therefore, the grant of a

nationality and of a country is made, as incidental to the execution of its gracious provisions. The appendages must not be mistaken for the substance. To exalt the gift of land and the numerous seed to the first place in this covenant, is to subvert the order of Heaven, and degrade the blessing promised to all nations.

Under this covenant, the *government* of the Church was transferred from the patriarch of the family, to an organized priesthood; and the rites were multiplied, or rather amplified. But, while modifications of forms may have been necessary in this transference, no new principle or doctrine was enunciated; no institution contradictory to, or subversive of, any previously existing was added. This covenant adopted all the facts developed by the past history of the race, all the great principles arising therefrom, and all the institutions and ordinances that had been established during the preceding 2000 years. It appropriated and embraced the covenant of security with Noah, and the Messianic line of descent through Shem. Its chief corner-stone is, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head."

Anterior to this covenant, for obvious reasons, the divine ordinances for the race—civil government and religious worship—were united in the person of the patriarch. But now the great contraction in the age of men, the multiplication of the race, the extent of territory occupied, and the progressive development of the kingdom of grace, rendered a divorce of the civil and ecclesiastical governments necessary. Families had expanded into nations; one natural head could no longer maintain universal supremacy, by reason of greater age and superior power; hence artificial and representative heads must supersede the patriarchal ruler. But with this necessitated diversity in the administration of the municipal governments, uniformity in the government of the Church must be perpetuated. This, the unity and immutability of its one supreme Head, principles, and design, demanded. This uniformity of administration could be attained only by the separation of Church and State, and the organization of the Church, under a special charter, and with divinely appointed officers, subordinate to the supreme Head.

Again, under this warrant the line of Messianic descent becomes more direct and clearly defined. From the "seed of the woman" it becomes "thy seed." Isaac is selected, to the rejection of Ishmael; Jacob, to the repudiation of Esau; Judah, in preference to all the tribes; the family of David, to all the other families of Judah; and the virgin, to all the other women of the family of David. To effect this and other auxiliary purposes, the families are organized into tribes, and the tribes into a nation. Thus the State is only auxiliary to the development of the covenant. Now, Church and State, flowing from the same fountain, must divide and remain severed, until reunited under the rule of Prince Messiah. To this end, king and priest are not only distinct officers, but spring from different tribes and families, until the coming of Shiloh. They are invested with different functions; the one with civil, the other with ecclesiastical authority. Nor can the one usurp and exercise the functions of the other, without a violation of the divine pattern given to Moses; for "See, said he, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the Mount."

The first proposition here presented is, that the Church was first organized, and only organized, into a distinct and separate body under the Abrahamic covenant, as subsequently developed by Moses. For 2000 years it had existed in all its essential facts, doctrines, and institutions, as a coördinate of the civil power; but there was no separate and visible organization, with its written charter and formal seal, until the race had arrived at this half-way position between Adam and Christ. So light was created on the first day, but the sun was not appointed to be the light-bearer of the heavens and the illuminator of the earth until the fourth day, midway between the Alpha and Omega of creation's complete work.

We find the Church a fixed institution; a government *in esse*, with its officers, ordinances, and sacramental seals. Whence did this wonderful phenomenon originate? Its history must answer the interrogatory. Some tell us that the Church was organized by the apostles. If this be true, we shall find the fact distinctly stated by them in the holy writings. They have given us an account of their acts and words,

their travels, labors, sufferings, and doctrines. In many things they have been minute. This was to be expected. Now, if they organized the Church, surely they have somewhere spoken of its inauguration—an institution, a form of government, that was to endure for all time, and to which all States are to be finally subjected. The names of those who found States and Empires, and of those who give constitutions to newly established kingdoms, ever fill a conspicuous place in the history of those States. Will the names of our revolutionary fathers, and their deeds, be ever blotted from the history of these United States? And if the apostles founded the Church—the kingdom that is to break in pieces all other kingdoms and fill the whole earth—must not incorruptible and faithful history record the deed immortal? Shall we not be plainly told when, where, and how, they set up this kingdom? We have a right to demand of the modern system-makers all this and more, and they are bound to give the evidence of sacred history, or else hold their peace. Let us begin with the latest records of sacred history and trace the course of events backward to their source.

John, the last of the twelve, speaks of the redeemed and triumphant Church, of its elders, with glittering crowns—twelve for the old, and twelve for the new dispensation. He numbers 144,000 members from the twelve tribes of Israel as the constituency of the former, and an innumerable multitude, that no man can number, for the apostles, all joining in the song of Moses and of the Lamb. He tells us nothing of its earthly organization. We go back to Paul, the last called of the apostles. He says nothing of any new organization, but labors strenuously to show the oneness of the spiritual Israel. With him the Church was an established institution. "Elias made intercession against Israel—I am left alone and they seek my life." Romans xi. Not so Elias: "I have reserved to myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant left according to the election of grace." Therefore "God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew." They have only stumbled, that, through their fall, salvation might come to the Gentiles. "For if the first-fruit be holy, the

lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree, boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive-tree, which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive-tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive-tree?"

In the foregoing there are two figures conveying the same ground idea, which is, that Israel is the people, or Church of God. The first teaches that the part has the nature of the whole; and the second, that the derived partakes of the nature of its origin. The first has reference to the consecration of the entire harvest, the offering of the first-fruits, or of the whole, by a part. In the second figure, which he elaborates, the root and good-olive tree are the same: the branches are the Jews; those branches that were broken off were the unbelieving Jews. But from what were they cut off? Certainly not from their nationality, or fleshly relationship to Abraham, but from the spiritual Israel, or Church of God. And wherefore? They had no life in them; they were sapless branches, "because of unbelief." Says Alford: "As Abraham himself had an outer and an inner life, so have the branches. They have an *outer life* derived from Abraham by physical descent. Of this no cutting off can deprive them; but they have, while they remain in the tree, an *inner life*, nourished by the circulating sap, by virtue of which they are constituted living parts of the tree. It is of *this life* that their severance from the tree deprives them; it is this life which they will reëquire if grafted in again." But the good olive-tree was not stripped of all its natural branches; no, not even in the great apostasy in the time of Elias; for God had reserved seven thousand



green and living branches to himself, that had not imbibed the deadly virus of idolatry; and says the apostle, "Even so then *at this present time* also there is a remnant, according to the election of grace. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew." The old tree still lives; its roots are strong, and its branches green. It has not been inverted by the ingrafting of the branches from the wild-olive tree. "Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." With the natural branches—Zacharias, Mary, John, the shepherds, Simeon, the first-called disciples, the devout women, the apostles, the pentecostal thousands, and all the ancient worthies—do ye Gentiles stand, and share "the fatness of the olive-tree." And into this parent stock shall the branches that have been broken off be grafted again, "if they abide not in unbelief, for God is able to graft them in again;" even "into their own olive-tree." In Ephesians v. 25-27, Paul is still more explicit: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church and gave himself for it." The Church was an established institution, according to Paul, anterior to the coming and death of Christ. As such he loved it, and gave himself for it, that he might effect its future purification and salvation; "that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish."

Let us go back to the apostles assembled in the council at Jerusalem. James, the brother of the Lord, delivers the decision of the council: "Men and brethren, Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets: After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning: wherefore my sentence is," etc. Bear in mind, that this was the first general council under the new dispensation; the question was such as to call forth the fact, if they had



founded a new Church. The very annunciation of the fact would have settled the whole controversy without disputation; but neither in the speeches, nor in the decision, is there the slightest intimation of any such thing; on the contrary, the Church is recognized as a fixed institution, and the decision is based upon its sacred records. Stephen says: "This is he (Moses) that was in the *Church* in the wilderness, with the angel that spake with him in the Mount Sinai." (Acts vii. 38.) With the first martyr, the Church existed in the days of Moses, and at the Mount.

Let us recur now to the day of Pentecost, and hear Peter's opening sermon, and learn its results. "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ; and the Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved." The Church, then, was something in being, to which additions might be made. If now for the first time organized, Peter speaks nonsense. Surely the language would have been: Many believed and the Church was organized. But there is no word uttered on this occasion to countenance any such notion. If we look to the transactions of the day, we can discover no proceedings of this character. They were altogether praying; but this was nothing new for God's Israel. The Holy Ghost descended upon them; but the prophets long before had possessed the same gift. "For prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Peter neither *organized* nor *assisted* in the organization of the Church; but in the third chapter of Acts he speaks of the Church as organized in the family of Abraham. Verse 22: "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." (v. 25.) The apostles neither formed, nor had any *authority* to form, a new Church; their commission was only to make disciples of all nations—to graft them into the good olive-tree.

If we examine the life of the divine Master, we find no attempt to found a new Church; but in all his teachings the Church is recognized as an existing institution. "He came to his own and they received him not." The vineyard, he said, should be taken away from the unbelieving Jews, "and given to a nation that shall bring forth the fruits in season." Lazarus is seen "afar off in Abraham's bosom." All is done that the Scriptures may be fulfilled. Mary said: "And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. He hath holpen his servant Israel in remembrance of his mercy: as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and his seed forever." The untied tongue of Zacharias sings, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people Israel, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David. To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant, the oath which he sware to our father Abraham." Matthew styles his gospel, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham." The new dispensation looks back to a Church organized long anterior to the birth of Jesus. In the execution of the Abrahamic covenant, all the rites and promises are fulfilled. Eight hundred years prior to the advent of the Saviour, Joel speaks of the Church, its officers, members, and rites. "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly: gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts: let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet. Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach." (Joel ii. 15, 16, 17.)

Special attention is called, first, to the phrase "sanctify the congregation." The Hebrew is קָדְשׁוּ קָהָל (kaddeshu qahal), which the LXX translated ἀγιάσατε ἐκκλησίαν (*hagiasate ekklesian*), and the Vulgate, *sanctificate ecclesiam*. *Qahal* is rendered both in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate by *ecclesia*; which term, the Greek and Latin lexicons say, "in ecclesiastical writers, means the Church, in its general and particular sense." Then the phrase *kaddeshu qahal* is correctly rendered

"sanctify the Church." Secondly, "Assemble the elders." The Hebrew is גִּבְעֵטוֹ זִקְנִים (*gibetsu zeqanim*), and the Greek ἐκλέξασθε πρεσβυτέρους (*eklexasthe presbuterous*). *Zeqanim*, Gesenius says, means "elders of Israel, of Egypt, of the city—i. e., *proceres*, senators, the chief men, magistrates; the notion of age being neglected,"—that is, they were office-bearers. The same is true of the Greek *presbuteroi*, which, when ecclesiastically used, signifies the officers or rulers of the Church. "Gather the children, and those that suck the breasts;" sanctify the whole Church—adults, children, and babes—by sprinkling the water of separation upon them—the water (*rantimon*) of sprinkling. Then let the priest weep and pray for the people. Thus, eight hundred years prior to the Christian era, the "solemn assembly," "the congregation," the Church, is called together for purely religious services. As the object in view is only to find the separate organization of the Church, it is not necessary to pause to consider the question of infant membership and the mode of baptism plainly shown in the passage. On back through all the prophets and the sacred books we find the Church an established government. For one thousand years Jehovah is known as the "God of Abraham." The covenant made with him is mentioned one hundred times, where those with Adam and Noah are mentioned eight or ten times; thus giving it the preëminence over all. Stephen pointed us back to Moses and the Church at Sinai; but we cannot stop with him. His mission was only to develop the Church and carry out a previously devised plan. The very language of his commission refers us back to Abraham. From the burning bush God says, "I am the God of Abraham." "I have seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt." "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations. Go, gather the *zeqanim*—the *presbuteroi*—the elders of Israel, together, and say," etc. Thus he is sent to God's people, his Church, with recognized officers, to effect their deliverance in the execution of the first branch of the Abrahamic covenant. Backward still we go to Abraham. Here we find the formation of

the everlasting covenant, attested by a sacramental seal, and constituting him the father of many nations, and securing blessings to all nations through the "thy seed." Here we find the divorce of Church and State, and the separate organization of the former. Here we have the *original* charter, warrant, and constitution of the Church of God on earth. Here is the origin of the phenomenon whose history we have been tracing. We are no longer referred backward. In the twelfth chapter of Genesis is mentioned the first interview that took place in Haran. Abraham is called to go to a strange land, under the guidance of God. The ground idea of the covenant—the Messiah—is given; the incidental circumstances, a numerous seed, and a land, are promised. Having arrived in the land (chapter xv.), the promises are repeated, and God reveals to him the sojourn and afflictions of his descendants in Egypt, their deliverance, and the boundaries of their future possessions. As yet he is unprepared to enter into a formal and sealed covenant with God. This covenant was to establish a union between God and man; but there could be no union without the recognition of God's holiness and man's impurity; for the object of the covenant is the purgation of guilt, and the sanctification of the sinner: hence the sacrifice is ordered. But Abraham, though reassured as to his protection from the enmity of the kings of the vale, and the certainty of the promised seed, is still ignorant of the *nature of that seed* in which all nations are to be blessed. Sarah's device fails; Ishmael is rejected; and now he is more fully instructed. Having been symbolically purged of guilt, and instructed, all the promises are reiterated, and the covenant is formally ratified and attested by a special seal, in chapter xvii.

I. The covenant. And "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." Of this, Paul says, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." (Galatians iii. 16.) The seed is Christ, and the whole passage is the gospel. "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed."

(Galatians iii. 8.) So then they which be of faith are blessed *with faithful Abraham.*

II. Its subordinate and subsidiary branches. 1. "Behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations." 2. "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land."

III. Its seal. "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee: every man-child among you shall be circumcised, and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you: he that is born in thy house, and that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." The incidental branches of the covenant have been fulfilled. The covenant *itself* is in *process* of fulfillment. From what has preceded, the following conclusions may be drawn: 1. The Abrahamic covenant was not personal, but representative, and realizes its culmination only in Christ. Personal it could not have been, for Abraham personally had but a limited seed, and neither he, nor any of his immediate family, ever inherited the land; nor did any of his descendants, until nearly six hundred years after the ratification of the promise. 2. The grand object of this covenant was not the securing of temporal benefits to the natural seed of Abraham, but the bestowment of spiritual and evangelical blessings upon all who should become his spiritual children by faith. This is evident from the exclusion of the families of Ishmael and of Esau from the inheritance of the land, though bearing the token of the covenant: and which, though ordered by Jehovah, was worthless unless spiritual in its import. Servants and proselytes from the nations were admitted to its benefits, upon submission to its sacramental seal. Circumcision was not then merely the sign of nationality. "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." (Romans iv. 13.) 3. It is an everlasting covenant. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant: to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." If everlasting, no subsequent and interme-

diat transaction can annul it. This follows, from the very necessity of the case. God's government, like himself, must be one and eternal. The grand and fundamental principles hereof must, therefore, be unchangeable. These principles constitute the *Magna Charta*—the organic law—the constitution of his empire. The object of his moral government is to secure the salvation of his rebellious subjects upon constitutional principles; and this is effected only through the Abrahamic covenant, or covenant of grace. The government is the same; the constitution is the same; yet there have been different earthly dispensations, or administrations, of this government under the same grand old covenant. Dispensation signifies the act of distributing, dealing out, etc., and in this connection specially denotes God's gracious and providential dealings with his Church, in the successive revelations of himself, and in the enactment of laws expressive of his will and gracious designs. It is, therefore, better expressed by the term administration. The government of the United States is the same; yet under the constitution thereof there have been many successive administrations. It is a misnomer to call it Washington's, Jefferson's, or Jackson's government. They were simply executive officers of the government, under the constitution, to administer the government for the specified objects. In like manner it is calculated to mislead to speak of the patriarchal Church, the Jewish Church, and the Christian Church. These are only successive administrations of the *one* Church.

The principles, then, of the constitution of the Church must have been in operation in all past administrations, and must continue in force as long as the Church has an earthly existence. The covenant provides for the happiness and salvation of sinners. It is God's revealed method of procedure in the accomplishment of this object; and whenever a sinner has been, or shall be, saved, this covenant must have been, and will be, in operation. The earthly development of the principles of this covenant would, *ex necessitate*, be progressive; and special revelations and enactments to carry out its provisions are to be expected; yet all in subordination to the divine charter, and in harmony with each other; for there can



here be no conflict of laws. Furthermore, all special laws and rules of the successive administrations must be adapted to, and productive of, the grand objects of the government—viz., the glory of God, and the salvation of man. Hence, the Mosaic administration, sometimes called “old covenant,” neither annulled this covenant, nor organized a new Church; but was only, as the word used—*diatheke*—signifies, a disposition, arrangement, or ordering of things, for the development of the covenant with Abraham. So Paul argues in Galatians iii. 15-17: “Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man’s covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God [*εἰς*] in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.” That is, a ratified and unrepcaled covenant cannot be set aside by a subsequent and subsidiary dispensation. The covenant with Abraham provided that justification should be the consequent of faith; the law, having been given 430 years posterior to this ratified covenant, could not provide justification by works; for if justification were by the law, then the former covenant is annulled, and “grace is no more grace,” which he declares impossible.

Furthermore, the Abrahamic covenant was “confirmed unto Christ,” the seed. But Christ did not come until 1911 years after the solemn ratification of this covenant. The law was given 430 years afterwards, or 1481 years before the promised seed should appear; therefore the law could not abrogate this covenant. The reasoning of the apostle is conclusive and unanswerable. The covenant with Abraham can be fulfilled only in Christ. Near 2000 years expired before his advent; the law was an intermediate and subsidiary transaction, and could not destroy the covenant, which was only to be clearly developed 1481 years afterward. To this covenant the law was added for specific purposes. “Wherefore serveth the law?” says the Jew. The apostle



replies: "It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." The law is an evidence of crime, a monument of the wickedness of the race. Men had lost sight of the original penalty of sin; they had not an adequate conception of the heinousness of sin. Hence the paternal government is superseded by the strictly and sternly legal dispensation. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." And the death penalty attached to so many of its provisions recalled the mind to the original declaration, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." They also needed a school-master to bring them to Christ for justification. Hence, when Christ came, that administration *expired by express limitation*, and the fully developed *beginning* of the covenant was inaugurated, and every believer becomes a part of the seed of Abraham. Hence Paul says: "For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them, but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." What was that gospel that was preached unto them? "In thee shall all nations be blessed." "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." This same gospel, Paul declares, was preached unto *us*. The basis—the central promise—ay, this covenant, stripped of its incidental features, is the gospel, "the everlasting gospel."

But it is objected that Jeremiah foretells the establishment of a *new* covenant, differing from the one made with the fathers when he brought them out of Egypt. Paul, in his comments, describes the latter as inefficient, old, and waxing to decay; and the former, as a better covenant, established upon better promises. In the enunciation of some of the different significations of the term covenant, it was said: "Sometimes it is the synonyme of dispensation or administration, especially when the Jewish economy is contrasted with the Christian." This passage, with Paul's commentary, was adduced as an illustration of this usage. That a *new* dispensation is the idea is evident from the passage itself, and also from the whole of the Epistle to the Hebrews. For what covenant (if it be a covenant) is to be superseded by the *new*

one, hereafter to be set up? Surely not the covenant with Abraham, for the very language of the prediction *names* and *dates* the one that is to be set aside. "The one made with your fathers." When? "In the day when I brought them out of Egypt." What else can, then, be meant than the entire ritual and ceremonial law given at Sinai? And even if we grant this to be by synecdoche called a covenant, the gospel contained in the Abrahamic covenant, ratified eight hundred years before, is not rendered inefficient, old, and ready to vanish away. This the apostle has shown in his unanswerable argument heretofore introduced. But further, the whole collocation clearly and strongly limits the word covenant and testament to dispensation or administration. "In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old." "Then seeing the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary," etc. There cannot be an allusion to any other than the tabernacle and temple, with its ordinances of divine service; for there was no "worldly sanctuary" attached to the covenant with Abraham, and its ordinances were simple. Again: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah," etc. Observe, first, that the new covenant spoken of is to be made with the *same parties*—the house of Israel and of Judah. Note, also, that this new covenant is conceded by all opponents to be the gospel; but Paul declares the Abrahamic covenant to be the gospel. Then the gospel must grow old and pass away, that the same gospel may be introduced! What absurdities system-makers attribute to the unerring Spirit of the living God!

Paul further tells us that the one to pass away consisted "only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the reformation"—the time of remodelling, reforming, and reërranging. What can be plainer? Why was this dispensation to pass away? Let Paul answer. Because it was faulty: 1. because it could not "make the comers thereunto perfect;" 2. because the import was unknown to the people; 3. it was only a "shadow of good things to come." "For if the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second."

Was the Abrahamic covenant faulty? If so, the *gospel* is; for he calls *that* the *gospel*. But he makes no such blunder. He strictly defines the one that was faulty—the one that “stood in meats and drinks,” etc., and had its laws written in tables of stone.

Again, he specifies how it was defective: “Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience.” The sense of guilt still remained, and was brought continually to remembrance by the annual sacrifices. “For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers, once purged, should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.” But in the coming days—the days of the promised seed—by the one offering, the “conscience shall be purged from dead works to serve the living God.” “For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” Ye shall no longer need laws engraven upon stones, and a burdensome ritual; for “I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, saying, Know ye the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.” This writing, as well as this knowledge, is the actual result; for, saith the apostle, “Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God, not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart.” The simple and the only meaning of the apostle and of the prophet is, that these types, shadows, and ceremonies, shall give place to the substance; and this legal dispensation shall be succeeded by the renewed, restored, and fulfilled Abrahamic covenant, in its spirituality and simpler dress, which all can understand.

The language of Jeremiah is: כרת ברית חדשה (*Karath berith chadash*); literally, I will cut a covenant anew from the divi-

sion of the victims sacrificed, on the ratification of the league. The adjective is derived from the verb  $\text{חדש}$  (*chadash*), to renew, to make anew, to restore. "Come, let us go to Gilgal and renew the kingdom" (1 Samuel xi. 14); that is, confirm it unto Saul. "Thou renewest thy witnesses against me." (Job xi. 17.) "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation." (Psalms li. 12.) Then the phrase literally rendered would be: I will renew, make anew, or restore, the covenant; that is, the intermediate and ceremonial dispensation shall vanish, and the covenant, with its spirituality, shall be renewed or restored. The apostle in his quotation uses a word which sustains this idea—viz.,  $\text{συντελέω}$  (*sunteleo*); which Schleusner, the most learned and able of Greek lexicographers, renders by *consummo*, to consummate; *perficio*, to complete, to perfect; *finio*, to finish, etc. The same apostle uses the same word in Philippians i. 6, which is translated "will perform," carry on, finish. Then the entire phrase,  $\text{συντελέσω διαθήκην καινήν}$  (*sunteleso diatheken kainēn*) may be rendered, I will consummate, complete, or perfect, the covenant anew. And the Abrahamic covenant is new, as contrasted with the covenant of works.

Again, there are two Greek words which are rendered covenant: first,  $\text{συνθήκη}$  (*suntheke*), which is the proper word for covenant, implying the equality of the parties; but this word is never used, either in the Septuagint or in the Old Testament, as applied to the arrangements or dispensations which God made with man; but the second word is uniformly employed—namely,  $\text{διαθήκη}$  (*diatheke*), which is derived from the verb  $\text{διατίθημι}$  (*diatithēmi*), to arrange, to dispose, to order. The noun occurs three hundred times in the Septuagint, and is the translation of  $\text{ברית}$  (*berith*) over two hundred times. It occurs thirty-three times in the New Testament, and nowhere else has it the signification of testament, or will. The conclusion, then, is legitimate: it is used here also in its uniform and ordinary acceptation. I will make a new  $\text{διαθήκην}$  (*diatheken*), is then, correctly rendered, I will make a new disposition—a new dispensation. So then, in whatever aspect we view it, there is no countenance given to the idea of the abolition of the Abrahamic covenant.

Similar promises were made when the Jews should return from the captivity. "And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh: that they walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God." (Ezekiel xi. 19.) The difference in the spirituality of the two dispensations is only one of *degree*, after all, and not of nature. But the spirituality and evangelical character of the covenant with Abraham is reserved for a future paper upon the *seal* of this covenant—viz., circumcision.

---

ART. VI.—*The Power of the Cross.*

THE lowest kind of power is physical force; every animate thing enjoys a measure of it. The very worms that crawl at our feet exercise it. It is generated in inanimate bodies by the action of mechanical and chemical laws. The river carries it in its bosom; it rides on the wings of the wind; the waves tell of it when they leap up and kiss the rocks. We harness it to drive our machinery, or summon it to hurl destruction upon our enemies. Its voice is heard in the scream of the locomotive; it thunders in the guns of battle.

The original purpose of this physical force, as developed in living creatures, is to secure the comfort and safety of the worm or the man that possesses it. In its earliest developments and lowest forms it is utterly blind; and even in its higher forms it is instinctively selfish. The mighty monsters that sport in the deep, and the minute animalcules that find a drop of water a world large enough for thousands of their race, all possess the common faculty of bodily strength; all use it to ward off the attack of enemies, and to procure subsistence and gratification. Many beasts and reptiles are mightier in limb and muscle than Goliath or Sampson; therefore, if this is the highest kind of power, an elephant or a crocodile is a nobler creature than man.

Intellectual power is entirely different in kind, and takes a much higher rank. Its primary and most obvious office is to direct and restrain physical force. Without some measure of intelligence to guide and control it, brute force, though at times it may be terrible, is blind and helpless. The strong man who loses his reason may not have grown weaker in muscle or sinew; but, with all this strength, he is more helpless. His case is a thousand times more hopeless than that of an infant. It is the mind-power that guides the puny hand of man, and enables it to overmaster the strong things of Nature. It insures his perpetual dominion over every beast of the field and every fowl of the air. Ocean cannot restrain it. It explores all the solitude of waters. Its ships rise and fall with every distant swell of the bosom of the sea. It seeks out every lonely island to people it; it ventures within the icy gates that shut us from the poles. It links shore to shore, spanning the waste with a telegraphic pathway, a ladder along which thought flies back and forth, like the angels ascending and descending before the eyes of the patriarch at Bethel. It says to the hills, "Be ye removed," and mighty engines busy themselves to perform the work. It changes the face of nature; it girds continents with railways; it leads the waters across the parched deserts. It is commissioned from on high to subdue the earth; and its triumphs will not cease till every domain of nature is conquered, and all the waste places are made glad with the homes of men.

The highest achievement of genius, according to the world's verdict, is to grasp and control the widest possible range of physical forces. Whoever subdues a new force immortalizes his name. It is this which embalms the memory of Watt, and Fulton, and Franklin, and Morse. Newton barely revealed to the world the existence of the force that causes the wonderful movements among the heavenly bodies; and, for revealing it, or making a bold guess about it, and giving it a name, though he could not enable us to comprehend or control it, we award him undying fame. The great primary work of intellect is to understand, to control, to guide, and to wield material forces. It may also find it necessary to control other intellects; but the end in view is to gain control of the



power they wield. It may contemplate the nature and the works of a higher Intelligence, of God; but the result of such theological and scientific studies, so far as they develop themselves practically, is to bring action into accord with the discovered laws of the Higher Mind. Intellect discovers that God has laid up gold in certain rocks. Physical strength is summoned to grind the rock to powder and sift the gold from the dust. The mind, in some way, becomes aware that God has made health dependent on a certain course of conduct. The feet of the wise are found walking in this way. Thus intelligence ever marks out a pathway for action. There is a partnership of intelligence and brute force. Intelligence investigates, decides, and commands; brute force executes. Their joint kingdom is of this world; the field of their operation is this world; their joint victories, so far as we now know, so far as they are separate from the control of higher faculties, will end with this world.

But there is a higher force which must control physical force and mind-force, and the two united. These, left to themselves or guided by evil, may be selfish, devilish. How often have the strong in body and intellect proved a scourge and a curse! Strength of body may become an evil thing; and the evil may be heightened, and the curse doubled, by strength of intellect. Miraculous power, miraculous control of matter and mind, would be no security against evil. It would be the more fearful if it chanced to be evil. There is, plainly, need of some higher force to take the helm and govern material force and intellectual force. Let us name this ruling power benevolence, love-force. You ask if no place is given to the power of morality, to the moral faculties. It is answered that morality is but the echo of love. The moral code is stern; it demands an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; "every one according to his deeds," is its rigid motto. But it makes this demand in the interest of love, or else it ceases to be morality. It is stern toward guilt, because it is tender and loving toward injured innocence. There is a fierce, unsanctified morality which becomes a sort of fiendishness. It takes a sort of devilish pleasure in the infliction of death for death, and burning for burning. But this is not

true morality, nor is any thing else that does not grow out of love. Love inspires a broader and more generous morality, a gentler and more salutary justice than the morality of retaliation or the justice of vengeance. Love teaches us to give to others, not what they deserve, but better things than they deserve; and to accept worse things for ourselves for others' sake. Christ came to put this love-power into fuller operation among men. This was the kingdom he came to set up. Greed, and strife, and hatred had ever ruled the nations. The strong had robbed and enslaved the weak. Patriotism, the chief virtue of the ancients, meant hatred and war toward all but the native tribe. It seldom shrunk from the commission of any inhumanity which promised to add luster to the nation's military fame or territory and slaves to the national possessions. It was only an extension of selfish love to the family, and afterward to the kindred families, that made up the clan, or the tribe, or the State. All outside of this circle were barbarians whom it was entirely proper—nay, highly praiseworthy—to hate; whose lands, and treasures, and lives, were a legitimate prey of warlike greed. Before and since the Christian era the greatest genius has, in a thousand instances, been turned into a curse. The heroes of classic song were the successful butchers of mankind. Read the long list, from the half-fabulous Hector and Achilles down along the bloody centuries, through the careers of Alexander, and Cesar, and Napoleon; seek out from the rubbish of history the half-buried memory of the thousands of lesser butchers who fill up the long gaps of time between these great names, and who, for their little day, reveled in blood and power; and when you have read it all, tell me if humanity does not cry out for some benigner power to restrain and control material and intellectual forces. The love-power was to bring all things into subjection to it. Its office is to restore peace on earth and good-will among men. Physical force, controlled by reckless and unscrupulous intellect, had been, through all the ages, now building up vast structures of power and wealth, now leveling them to the dust, crushing millions in the ruins.

Christ came to set up a new kingdom; not a kingdom of bodily power, not an empire of intellectual glory, but an all-

pervading empire of love, which should subdue the untamed physical force in man, and beast, and nature itself, and make it a minister of peace and joy, that should guide the intellectual powers into the discovery of blessings for the race. He must give a high, memorable example of this new love-force. He must become a Hero and a Champion in this new battle-field. He was to be the King—he *was* the King; and, to vindicate this high claim before men, and angels, and devils, he must show himself greatest in the new kingdom which he set up. While he was suffering the agony and the shame of crucifixion, they said, with bitter taunts, "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross;" and some have wondered why he, whose slightest breath could whisper the raging elements into silence, permitted this jeering triumph. Had he yielded to the taunt, and come down from the cross, it would indeed have been the highest proof of physical power—of control over matter; but it would have been only the realization of the heathen Hercules. It would have been a display of such strength as worms possess. His kingdom was not of this world; the strength by which he was to conquer was not bodily strength. It was not intellectual power; it was the power of love—the power of the cross.

On other occasions he had given the highest proof of unlimited power over matter. The sea obeyed his voice. He walked upon its waters. He stood by the grave, and the dead came forth at his bidding. Nor was he wanting in intellectual power. He perceived the very thoughts of those about him. How often did his withering words goad the scribes and Pharisees into silence! When the adulterous woman was brought to him he had but to utter one searching sentence, and her proud accusers, one by one, slunk away abashed and confounded. But he that had saved others did not save himself—"could not," said the jeering multitude. Possessing the strength of Deity, he did not assert it for his own deliverance. He hurled no avenging lightnings upon the scoffers. His prayer was, "Forgive them, they know not what they do." "When he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing. And Pilate said unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against

thee? And he answered him to never a word, insomuch that the governor marveled greatly." One who had been so eloquent to save another, even when the law condemned her, was now silent when he himself was accused without cause. No wonder Pilate marveled. He did not understand that the power by which this new King was to conquer was not force, or eloquence, or intellect, but self-denying love.

Now, the test of the strength of this love-force, in any given case, is what it voluntarily suffers for others. If capital punishment is ever proper, the victim suffers in the interest of benevolence. Not that he is benevolent, but the cause of benevolence is supposed to be furthered by his death. His suffering gives no proof of love in his own heart; first, because he suffers by constraint; and, secondly, because he suffers deservedly. The former miracles of Jesus prove that he could have saved himself. He did not suffer by constraint. His death was voluntary. He had "power to lay down his life and to take it again." Did he deserve to suffer? There are two senses in which suffering may be said to be deserved: first, when the sufferer is guilty; second, when others have strong claims on him. We despise a man who would hesitate to risk his life—nay, who would not die, when by doing so he could save his children or his dear friends from death. We might, any of us, be placed in circumstances in which it would be duty to risk, perhaps to lose, our lives, in which to save our lives would be to lose them. That man is justly infamous who deserts his friends in an hour of danger in order to save his own life.

Did Christ *deserve* to suffer for either of the reasons named? His bitterest opposers do not charge him with any crime. All admit that he was pure and spotless. Pilate, who was certainly not biased by prejudice in his favor, declared that he found no fault at all in him. He did not, then, deserve death on account of guilt. Did those for whom he died have claims on him which made it binding for him to die? The men who spit upon him and crucified him were those for whom he suffered. "Scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet, peradventure, for a good man some would even dare to die; but God commendeth his love toward us, in that while

we were yet sinners Christ died for the ungodly." The death of Christ was the greatest possible display of that self-denying love which we have seen is the beneficent power that is to bring all material and intellectual forces under its mild sway. No sacrifice is greater than the sacrifice of life. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Christ's was greater than any man's love, for he laid down his life for his deluded enemies; he died that he might win them to their own salvation. No sacrifice can ever equal it in magnitude; for no other life can ever be worth as much as the life of Jesus. Suffering was never so entirely voluntary, never so completely undeserved. No other sufferer ever was, or ever can be, so strong and so spotless; so able to deliver himself, and so worthy to be delivered. This is the secret of the power of the cross. Had he descended from the cross, it would have been miraculous, brute force. Had he, by some moving speech or some supernatural revelation of his true character, caused his murderers to relent and set him at liberty, or had he opened their eyes to the truth, and caused them to fall at his feet and kiss his wounds, it would have been a miracle of intellectual power—of power over mind. But he was not to make a display of material force or mental force, but of the power of loving self-denial, of suffering for others. He was to show, in the grandest light, that charity which "endureth all things;" and this was the most God-like display that could have been made.

This power of the cross is the real efficient force in the kingdom of Christ. It has won every real victory which has ever crowned the gospel. In it is the real strength of every Christian soldier. Wealth, and numbers, and learning, and intellect, are all in vain without the power of love and self-denial. "Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, . . . and though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." Constantine brought the wide Roman Empire under the nominal sway of the cross by the sword of military and civil power; but Christianity, if set up by the strength of earthly princes only, is not permanent, is not real. He that takes the sword shall per-

ish by the sword. Churches, established by force, or wealth, or by any thing short of the love-power, may be overthrown by a stronger combination of force, or wealth, or intellect. This power of the cross is the secret of every reformation and of every revival of the truth. The giant achievements of force quickly pass away. The cold efforts of intellect are fruitless; but force or intellect, controlled by the divine love-power, is immortal. Its achievements endure forever; its power abides forever. The splendid temples, erected and endowed by the power of wealth, the charm of music, the captivating voice of eloquence that sways the vast multitude of worshippers, the glitter, the influence, and the numbers, without the love-power, without the spirit of humility and self-denial, are sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. Men wonder when the gorgeous temples are deserted and are in ruins, when the proud multitudes are swept away, and the brilliant products of genius and oratory are unheeded and forgotten. They wonder to see some despised child of poverty and obscurity, some carpenter's son, or fisherman, rising up and bringing greater blessings than all the cultivated and brilliant multitude, and erecting out of the weak things of this world a more enduring structure than wealth, or power, or genius ever builded.

The same power of the cross by which the Captain of our salvation, being "made perfect through suffering," gained the victory, is to be our success. The soldiers of Constantine saw, or thought they saw, inscribed in burning characters on the sky these words, beneath a celestial cross: *Εν τῇ νικᾷ*. The same is written for us; it is written on the past; it flames up above the horizon of the dawning future. Conquer by this: by the power of love, the power of the cross.

Christ could have descended from the cross; he might have displayed physical power or mind-power instead of the power of love. We too may, if we will, come down from the cross. But if we would share in the victory, and the perfectness, and the glory, we must also share in the suffering. We are ever prone to substitute some lower force for the power of love. It is so easy to yield strength, intellect, conscience—every thing—to the popular cry of the multitude about us; it is so



pleasant to stand with the majority; it is so much more in accord with our nature to shout the praises of some dead Moses of the past, than to share in the reproach and the suffering of the living Christ of the present; wealth, and power, and influence, present such "flowery beds of ease," that we are tempted to forsake the paths of self-denial and suffering, and to walk in the smooth, deceitful ways of ease and empty show. If we deny ourselves nothing; if we suffer nothing; if we bear no reproach in the cause of humanity and the right; if we stand aloof from struggling principles of moral duty; if we reach out no helping hand to the millions in our own country and in every country, who are painfully toiling upward in the path of physical, and mental, and moral improvement; if we suffer ourselves to be borne along with the selfish and blinded multitudes who wag their heads when truth and humanity are crucified, we show a lack of the loving spirit of our Saviour. "If so be that we suffer not with him," and with his cause, and with the poor, how shall we hope to be glorified together? If we accomplish any really good work, we must sometimes suffer silently in the face of scorn and sneers. People will misunderstand us, and take our strength for weakness, and our good for evil. They will say: "If he has the image of God, if he is a man, let him come down from the cross." How many would serve Christ if scoffers did not wag their heads! They shrink from the cross.

Men honor those who make a great display of outward good. God honors those who love much and sacrifice much. How many feet toil wearily with burdens too heavy! And still the lips utter no complaint. They endure for Christ's sake; and, when they drop into the dust, the world heeds not their loss; they are quickly forgotten, while the praise of some self-indulgent miser, who hoarded his ill-gotten gain all his life, and then tossed it to the hungry multitude at the approach of death, fills every mouth. But God rewards the faithful soul in every walk of life. We should not wait till we are about to die. We should get the love-power now, and begin to make men better and happier now. We should scatter good while we are yet pressing on in our lifetime journey, that the harvest may make us glad before we pass away.

As Christians, as ministers, as a Church, have we this essential power of self-denying love? John tells us that we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. The power of religion is the love-power which leads us to suffer and deny ourselves for others. We ought to exercise it. It should ever live in our hearts. If we do only just what is convenient, what we can do easily, what gives us no trouble, how unlike Christ we are! He laid down his life for us; we think it hard to sacrifice a little of our time and a little of our money for him!

I love to think that Jesus thought of me in his agony; that his love for me helped to nerve him for the struggle of the cross. He tasted death for me. My case, every case, was specially remembered. Some may not care for it. Some may sneer at it, and reject his love; but he loved and pitied "every man." His gentle hand is ready even now to reach down and lift up the fallen, and fill the broken-hearted with thanksgiving and joy. Our love and suffering can never reach out and extend itself to every especial case, to every circumstance, with the universal sympathy and help that our Saviour's omniscience and omnipotence enabled him to exercise; but his love is to be the type of ours. Our physical and intellectual powers are limited; but body and mind are to be laid on the altar of the love-power. Our thoughts must be ruled by it; our hands must obey its mandates. All the mind, and all the soul, and all the strength, must be devoted to its service.

We are feeble now; our life is but budding forth a little. If we yield our souls to the love of Christ, it will warm our love into new life, as the gentle influence of the sun in spring-time whispers to the bursting buds, and bids the leaves and flowers come forth.

ART. VII.—*Faith.*

FAITH is a topic upon which much has been said, and much written; still the subject is not exhausted. Possibly a great deal that has been said or written may have served only to darken counsel. The writer, conceiving that he has some views of faith which, if clearly presented, may be made useful, ventures, in this article, to present his thoughts. The reader may be assured, in the outset, that it is not intended to discuss the question of faith in its widest sense, but rather to direct attention only to two or three points.

First: *there is a difference between faith and its exercise.* This, perhaps, has been overlooked, to the great detriment of this vital subject. Surely, faith is one thing, while believing is another and quite a different thing. The difference between the two is as marked and obvious as is the difference between the hand and handling, or between the eye and seeing. It is admitted, however, that the term faith is frequently used in the Scriptures to include both faith and its exercise; as, for instance, in Romans v. 1. The apostle's meaning in this passage is fully explained by himself in Acts xiii. 39. He says: "And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." In the former passage, therefore, the term faith is used metonymically, or rather inclusively; as is the case in a great many other passages.

But what *is* faith, as distinguished from its exercise, according to the Scriptures? Faith is *that gracious ability and disposition which enables the penitent to trust the Saviour*; believing implies *the proper use and employment* of that ability and disposition. This, it is believed, entirely sweeps away all theological ground for the famous controversy as to whether faith is the gift of God, or the act of the creature. No one believes that man possesses, independently, this ability and this disposition; and, certainly, no one can believe that God puts them in exercise for man. Hence, since all believe that God alone can give this gracious ability and disposition, and that man alone can

exercise them, the writer feels that he is in perfect accord with both parties on this question, when he says: *Faith is the gift of God, and its exercise, or believing, is the work of man.* If the term faith is used to include its exercise, there is no particular objection to that seemingly contradictory saying to which our fathers appear to have been partial: "Faith is the gift of God *and* the act of the creature." But, when this form of expression is used, would it not be better to explain a little? It is here assumed that, in every instance, where Christ and his apostles undertake to specify the precise thing to be done, in order to secure divine favor, the term believe, or its equivalent, is used. But now, if faith, as it has been explained, is the gift of God, is that gift conditional or unconditional? The answer is, it is conditional. Even where the ability to believe a thing is produced by the force of testimony, the creature must have a will to examine that testimony, and open the heart and mind to receive its force. It is true that God's providence and grace may conspire to force the ability and disposition to believe a fact; and then the exercise of faith becomes involuntary. This, perhaps, never occurs but for man's awakening or punishment. In bringing man to Christ, sufficient evidence and influence are afforded to enable him to believe that God is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him. But having been awakened by the sovereign act of grace, the creature is called upon to examine and receive the testimony and influence on which this ability and disposition are founded. A spirit of inquiry is then awakened in the heart. The Spirit and truth of God show him what he ought to do. If obedient, grace not only enables him to take each successive step, but the taking of each step secures more grace, until he arrives at the high stand-point of ability and disposition to trust the Saviour. Or, to use the language of the sainted Donnell, man arrives at that point by walking on two feet—one is grace, and the other is duty. Another question may be raised here: Is the exercise of the gracious ability and disposition referable to a *necessary* consequence of their existence? By no means. It is believed that a man may go even thus far, and still fall short of the divine blessing. In other words, he may have

the gift of faith, but refuse to exercise it. Is not this what the apostle means when he speaks of a dead faith? If this be so, then it is not faith, strictly speaking, which saves, but its exercise.

Now, if the thoughts thus far presented have been clearly apprehended by the reader, he is prepared for the prominent and important point of this communication. This matter may, perhaps, be most effectively brought up by asking the following question, *What is the penitent sinner required to believe in order to obtain salvation?* This question has been asked times without number; but not as often answered definitely and intelligibly. The question, "What must I do to be saved?" was not only asked by the Philippian jailer, but has been echoed from every Christian altar-place, public and private, from that day to this, wherever anxious souls have been found. When that most appropriate answer of the apostles has been given, the inquirer says: I believe the Bible; I believe that Christ is the Saviour of sinners; "what lack I yet?" At this point multitudes have lingered for a time, and then returned to sin. But what is the penitent required to believe? *He is required to believe that his sins are pardoned.* To many this may seem a strange position. The assumption that man can believe only that which is sustained by competent testimony, has unfortunately become almost universal. Men, therefore, in seeking pardon, look to their own experience for the evidence that they have received it; and, until such evidence is obtained, they will never be satisfied. Human consciousness is very correctly regarded as the only source of competent evidence on a subject of this sort. The conclusion is, therefore, legitimate, but the premise is false. The writer assumes and proposes to maintain that saving faith does not rely on testimony, in the ordinary acceptation of that term, but exists, and must be exercised, in direct opposition to it. It exists and goes out upon the divine promise, and not upon testimony. To seek for such testimony is, in the true Scripture sense of the word, to confer with flesh and blood. That this is the scriptural view of the subject, let a few passages prove: "Therefore I say unto you, what things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have

them." (Mark xi. 24.) If this passage be closely scanned, it will be seen that the foregoing doctrine assumed is succinctly stated, and forcibly proved. That the doctrine may be comprehended more clearly, let us apply it. Here is one seeking pardon—he prays for it, and then asks his own feelings, Am I pardoned? They unhesitatingly answer, No! He prays again, asks the same question, and receives the same answer; and so he may continue to do to his dying hour. A sense of guilt and condemnation still remains. He seeks for knowledge, the highest grade of knowledge, that derived from consciousness, before he will trust Christ. Could he obtain it, then he would act from knowledge, not from faith. But it is impossible. Now, what can he do? Jesus tells him, "Believe that ye receive it." Not that he will receive it, but that it is a present reality. Then, when the penitent prays for pardon, let him not ask, Am I pardoned? but let him assume, with unshaken confidence in the oath and promise of the Lord, I am pardoned. One, perhaps, will ask, Is not this dangerous presumption? The answer is, It is just such presumption as the passage under consideration not only authorizes, but absolutely requires. Again: "And this is the confidence that we have in him, that, if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us: and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him." (1 John v. 14, 15.) The language of the fifteenth verse is certainly not only very strange, but incomprehensible, and even contradictory, if the doctrine here contended for be rejected. "If we know that he hear us," this is faith. "We know that we have the petitions that we desired of him." Full reliance with prompt action on this truth is the proper exercise of faith.

It is needless to multiply passages on this subject. The foregoing are sufficiently full and plain. And this is no new doctrine. It was the key-note of the gospel in the primitive age of the Church; and, though lost amid the darkness of the middle ages, it took a prominent stand by the side of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, in the great revival of evangelism in the sixteenth century. Luther says: "We are justified freely for Christ's sake through faith, when we be-



lieve that our sins are forgiven in virtue of Christ who by his death has made satisfaction for our sins." ("Hist. of the Reformation," Vol. IV. p. 176.) This language is strong, plain, and to the point. Most unfortunately, however, this great doctrine has received too little attention in our day. Hence the distressing uncertainty that perplexes and troubles the minds, not only of anxious inquirers, but also of those who endeavor to instruct and encourage them. The ministry, the Church, deeply interested friends, exclaim, as with a thousand tongues, *Believe! BELIEVE!!* believe in Christ. But the penitent thinks he does believe, because the precise point he is to believe is not made sufficiently prominent before his mind. Rather, let the instructor urge the anxious soul to believe with all his heart that his sins are pardoned, because Jesus has promised, and cannot lie. In addition to this let him be instructed and encouraged to act promptly and at once on this presumption, as though it were an ascertained fact, as a means of obtaining the conscious evidence of its existence.

This beautiful gospel scheme honors God by requiring the penitent to believe the existence of a thing dependent on his promise and veracity alone, and in the absence of all evidence—nay, contrary to all evidence, both external and internal. It brings the soul to the point where it is fully prepared to adopt the sentiment of the apostle, in its most extended signification: Let God be true, but every man, every circumstance, and every feeling, a liar. This honors the Divinity in the highest sense of which humanity is capable. And it is infinitely right and proper that from such a point as this the Christian's journey should be commenced. The same character of trust, regardless of circumstances, appearances, facts, and feelings, must possess his heart through life and in death, if he would live usefully and happily, and die triumphantly. The apostle, therefore, admonishes: "As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him." In every good word and work, he is to ask the help of God, and then, without inquiring whether God will grant it, *act* on the assurance of an answer, and he shall have it.

It has been said, incidentally, that consciousness affords the highest grade of information of which we are susceptible.

This proposition may, perhaps, be challenged. It has indeed been assumed by logicians and moralists that, while our consciousness is fully competent to testify as to the honesty of our intentions, it is not capable of giving any reliable information as to the truth or falsehood of facts or doctrines. This piece of impudent dogmatism has wrought a world of mischief to the cause of religion, mainly through the incautious admission of its truth on the part of the Church. With it the following distinct issue is made: Consciousness is the source of knowledge in matters of faith of a higher grade than can be obtained from any other available source. The apostle says, as quoted above, "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him." (Col. ii. 6.) He farther says: "Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same things." (Phil. iij. 16.) These instructions are certainly meaningless, if consciousness can give no reliable information. They are addressed to those who have made some progress, some attainment, in the Christian life. It is assumed that such know that they are right so far. This knowledge can be obtained from no source but experience or consciousness. If such information be impossible, then the admonition would amount to this: Persevere in your dubious way, as you have stumbled through darkness thus far; you may be right, or you may be wrong—no one can tell. Oh horrible! The gospel admits of no such confusion.

To illustrate this doctrine, let us suppose a teacher with a class in practical chemistry. He wishes to prove the doctrine of the books by producing the common drug calomel. He tells his class to combine mercury and chlorine in certain proportions, and under certain conditions. They try it and fail. What is their conclusion? That their teacher and the books are wrong? No; but that there is a defect in the experiment. They try again, and again, till they succeed. But how do they know that they have succeeded? Certainly, by reaching the proposed result. Now he wishes them to demonstrate farther by performing the same experiment again. He says to them: "As you did this time, so do again." Or, perhaps, the figure may be a little more appropriate, if we suppose that

he wishes to prove to them that the inhalation of chloroform will render the physical system insensible to pain. One of them is directed how to inhale the drug. He follows the instruction, till he realizes the result proposed. He knows he has applied the proper drug, and in the right way. How? By his feelings. "Now," says his teacher, "whenever you wish to produce this result, mind the same things—walk by the same rule." So Christ in his gospel says: Adopt certain doctrines, act upon them in a certain way, and you shall realize the blessings of pardon. He defines very accurately the result to be produced—peace of conscience, love for the brethren, etc. The inquirer tries, and fails; he tries again, and fails. Many at this point, unwisely and illogically, conclude that the teaching is wrong, and turn back; whereas, the rational conclusion should be that there is a defect in the experiment. Acting on this conclusion, the seeker tries again, and succeeds; that is, he obtains peace with God and love for the brethren. Now, the question is, How does he know that he has arrived at this result? How does the mother know that she loves her child? Consciousness is the only source of information on subjects of this sort. Doctors and philosophers may, with some sort of prospect of success, reason with a man against knowledge obtained from any other source; but no one in his senses will try to reason a man out of what he feels. Hence the conclusion is, that consciousness is the source of the highest grade of knowledge. Some have denominated this knowledge the faith of assurance; but it is not faith at all; it is rather the result of faith. What a man believes he cannot know; and what he knows he cannot believe. This is the knowledge which Job and Paul had, and which every experimental Christian has.

The mischievous error herein set forth has pointed the shafts of ridicule, which infidels and errorists in religion have hurled with such withering effect at experimental Christianity. Planting their feet on this logical fallacy, they have sneered and scoffed at feeling in religion until, in many portions of the Church, good men and women are ashamed to give full expression to their deep emotions. This fearful current threatens to sweep away the vital energies of the Church,

and break the right arm of its strength. That this is no phantom-fear appears in a thousand different ways. For example; a revival minister of this day reports, through the columns of a religious journal, the results of a good meeting in a certain church. Among other things, he is apt to say that there was very little feeling, or, as he calls it, excitement, during the occasion! Heaven save the Church from such revivals! Souls converted, angels rejoicing, and no excitement! Perhaps the writers of such articles may intend to say that there was no disturbance, or confusion. If that is their meaning, it is to be desired that they should say so in plain terms. For one, the writer feels that he has pandered too much and too long to this wretched and mischievous idea.

Before bringing this article to a close, it may be well to recur to a thought passed over rather hastily. It has been assumed that saving faith rests on a promise, and not on testimony. The position is not intended to exclude testimony from God's word and Spirit, or from other sources, which would encourage and enable the penitent to put forth the required action, on the presumption of pardoned sin. He is greatly encouraged, in fact, to do so, because, as he learns, every saint now in glory, and every Christian on the way, was once just where he is, and obtained God's mercy by the steps he is urged to take. But it is rather intended that there exists no evidence, either internal or external, of the existence of the thing upon which he is required to act; that is, that his sins are pardoned. He obtains conscious knowledge of that fact only by acting on the presumption. To some this knowledge comes immediately; to others, later. This difference depends on a great variety of considerations which it is not necessary to enumerate here. It is also various in its clearness in different persons. This also may result from various causes—mainly, perhaps, from a difference in their previous moral state. The cause of this difference, in many cases, may be illustrated thus: A man sets out to travel to a certain point in the darkness of a moonless, starless night. As he blunders on through thick darkness, the day-dawn appears in the eastern horizon. When he arrives at the place of his destination, he is asked, Where were you when day

appeared? He can tell the very place, because the contrast was so great. He marked the first gleam of its appearance. Another makes the same journey by night; but he enjoys the bright light of the full moon. Day appears while he is on his journey; and, when asked where he was when day broke, he can scarcely tell. He will, perhaps, say it was somewhere between two points, quite distant, may be, from each other. He knows it was night when he began his journey, and that day appeared before it was ended; but the contrast was not sufficiently great to mark the place with precision.

---

ART. VIII.—*"The Plymouth Pulpit."*

"Plymouth Pulpit." A Weekly Publication of Sermons preached by HENRY WARD BEECHER. New York: J. B. Ford & Co., Park Row.

THE author of these sermons, impelled by a large philanthropy, or by an all-devouring ambition for notoriety, or by an irrepressible instinct for empirical agitation, or by some other motive, displays an activity and an energy seldom equaled by the friends or the enemies of truth and religion. He plays the parts of preacher, editor, politician, and general lecturer on the popular subjects of the times, and orator of the day on special occasions. His organ of self-esteem has certainly been subjected to no extraordinary repression—perhaps has been rather abnormally stimulated. His conceitedness seems, if possible, to surpass his activity and energy. No man, perhaps, has less diffidence of his abilities, or more confidence in the correctness of his opinions. He really seems to think no subject, involving the temporal or spiritual interests of the public, sufficiently illuminated, until he has shed upon it the light of his transcendent genius, thus betraying a low opinion of the abilities of other men, and a most exalted opinion of his own. Glorifying in his dreams of universal progress, and of a higher development of the human race, he makes indiscriminate war on the opinions and customs of the

past. He seems really to think that all the organic and conventional forms in human society should be smelted down and recast, and that Henry Ward Beecher would be the proper man to superintend the job!

This overweening confidence Mr. Beecher, more or less offensively, displays on almost every page of the "Plymouth Pulpit." A specimen may be found on page 447, Vol. IV. He says: "I remember, in my youth, when the discussion waxed high between me and my father, turning upon some such question as this." (By the way, did the remembering occur in his youth, or did the discussion? Did our author do the turning, or did the discussion do it?) "'Now,' said I, 'father, was it a good act or a bad act in that man (who had perilously taken another from the water) to risk his own life to rescue a fellow-man from drowning?' 'There was no virtue in it,' said father; 'it was a mere nat'ral impulse—a mere nat'ral impulse.' 'Well,' said I, 'suppose such nat'ral impulses were spread all through a man, what would be the difference between nat'ral impulses and grace?'" We have quoted this passage only to show the style of the man. Suppose young Hercules did, in his opinion, floor his father—one of the ablest men of the times—is it becoming in Mr. Beecher, now an old man, thus gratuitously and ostentatiously to celebrate his victory over his discomfited father? This filial indecency is intensified by turning his father's language into ridicule. If he can thus glorify himself at the expense of his pious old father, he surely will not complain at a little plain dealing with his own performances.

He says that Moses was "one of the few preëminently great minds; one of the four or five men of the world's history, as a leader, as an organizer, as a legislator, as a hero." Modesty, perhaps, prevented him from giving the names of these four or five preëminently great men—less than one to the thousand years. The reader can scarcely avoid the thought that the last of these preëminently great men stood forth with sufficient distinctness in our author's mind. He says elsewhere that men of certain characteristics are born to instruct and rule the world. These characteristics he arrogates, in numerous places, and in different forms of expression, to him-



self. He evidently believes—believes sincerely, perhaps presumptuously—that he, like Moses and Jeremiah, was born to be a teacher and a ruler. Moses distrusted his own abilities. Mr. Beecher is afflicted with no such unmanly weakness, but feels himself fully equal to his Heaven-appointed mission. There seems to be no heights too steep, no depths too profound, for the attempts of his genius. He speaks and writes, not with the diffidence appropriate to men beset with the frailties of fallibility, but as an oracle to whom darkness is as the light. This boldness of his utterances will compel the assent of those who are unable to think for themselves, and who receive their opinions on trust. All such, as well as those who greatly admire him for qualities truly worthy of admiration, will adopt many of his opinions, and imbibe something of his spirit and taste. The "*Plymouth Pulpit*" is accordingly destined to wield a large influence on the literary, religious, and political interests of the country. We are consequently to have a Beecherian element infused into the American mind, modifying, more or less, for good or ill, our taste, our literature, our philosophy, our religion.

The "*Plymouth Pulpit*" is one of the mediums through which Mr. Beecher seeks to indicate his taste and opinions, and all that is peculiar to himself, to the minds of the people. This publication, therefore, becomes an appropriate subject of examination. His politics, more or less prominent in almost every sermon, we surrender to the consideration of demagogues, knaves, tricksters, and all others who have an inclination for such studies. His literature, philosophy, and theology, we wish briefly to notice. That Mr. Beecher has merits of some kind, as a writer, a philosopher, and a theologian, it were ungenerous to deny. He has words in smothering profusion. His vocabulary is respectably, but not extraordinarily, large. It is not his variety, but the multitude of his words, that distinguishes his style. He has wonderful fertility of imagination; indeed, his mind seems to be nearly all imagination—sail without ballast. His imagination, though wonderfully active, is neither strong nor correct. His fancy plays with a great many things; but they are always little things, or the little features of great things—Cowley-like, not Milton-like.

There is often a sort of charm, a playful witchery, in his style. This is the chief, if not the sole, merit of his compositions.

This attractiveness in his writings results from a variety of causes. The first to be noticed is his rhetorical figures. He abounds largely in tropes. Scarcely a paragraph is written which is not set off with a rhetorical flourish. His favorite figure is *prosopopœia*. This, it is true, is the lowest and simplest form of embellishment; still, when skillfully used, it gives beauty and vivacity to language. There may be symmetrical beauty in the chiseled marble; but, if it could be made "instinct with life," the magic power of its beauty would be greatly increased. Mr. Beecher has no sympathy with unlively words, or with the plain and unadorned forms of speech. He must put life into the marble. Into inanimate things he breathes the breath of life, giving them sensibility and the faculties of thought and speech. To immaterial things, such as appetites, passions, and affections, he ascribes thought and reason. Mr. Beecher is not always happy in the use of this figure. He employs it too often, and sometimes overstrains and spoils it. He is strongly inclined to the use of what may be called the redundant simile, or overloaded comparison. He is passionately fond of illustration, and often attempts to illustrate propositions which are so plain that no illustration can make them plainer. This habit is objectionable, because it gives useless labor to both writer and reader, and because it subjects the writer to the suspicion of seeking to illustrate himself, rather than to profit his readers. He displays, however, wonderful fertility in the invention of illustrations. Many of them are striking and beautiful; but they are generally given with quite too much detail. Instead of seizing upon the actual point of resemblance, and bringing that out, unincumbered with useless rubbish, so that the reader cannot fail to apprehend the exact truth intended to be presented, he almost invariably brings forward a group of details, comprising something of a history, real or supposititious. The mind of the reader is as likely to be impressed with one feature of the little story as another, and often fails to see the likeness in the illustration to the point in hand; or has his thoughts and imagination so occupied with things foreign to the sub-

ject, as not to feel the force of the particular truth intended to be illustrated and impressed. This mode of using what is intended as an illustration, generally, and very naturally, results either in confusing the mind of the reader, or in diverting it from the subject. If the discovery of truth to the mind of the reader, as well as its enforcement, is the object, then it certainly is better to use no illustrations at all than to use them with such results. If, however, the sole, or even the chief, object is to illustrate the writer, and please or entertain the reader with pretty or unique fancy-sketches, pen-pictures, or word-paintings, then it is all very well. Truth, not being the object, need not be looked for. It is enough to be careful of what will best display the particular humors of the writer, and best entertain and please the reader. Such writers may be read with much interest, but cannot be studied with much profit. If they profit at all in the way of instruction, it is only for the anecdotal or incidental information they communicate.

Another defect observable in our author's illustration is the material fact that, in some instances, the point of similitude is unreal, has no foundation in fact, is a mere conceit. In other instances it is so feeble and so subtle as to be worse than worthless, because it is productive only of confusion. These little narratives, supposititious histories, anecdotes, episodes, or what not, have, however, an interest all their own, on account of which the reader is often made greatly to admire the sermon. The metaphor, perhaps the finest of all the rhetorical figures, Mr. B. less frequently employs. It is quite too stately and brief in expression to suit his babbling style.

Our author rejoices in the proprietorship of a species of wit which he sometimes fails to subordinate to the decorums of time and place. Wit, in the hands of some men, is a dangerous tool. Like a two-edged sword, it cuts right and left. Mr. Beecher's is not of this kind. His hurts nobody—neither burns nor stings, and is not likely to create enmities nor provoke revenge. It is comic wit, not serious, and, indeed, often becomes mere buffoonery. Mr. Beecher, by the unreasonable indulgence of his *penchant* for the comic, often destroys the impressiveness of the most solemn truths, and even contrives

to make them ludicrous. Such humor is quite incompatible with the quiet and earnest gravity of the pulpit, and is a complete exterminator of every thing like deep, religious emotion. Our author seems either not to know this, or to prefer a comic facetiousness in his reader to a deep and thoughtful seriousness.

Mr. Beecher believes that he was born for the pulpit, as was Jeremiah for the prophetic office. If so, has there not been some disturbance in the laws of preëstablished harmony, or in "the laws of development"? If born with any special destination, it would seem that it was with a special adaptation to the comic department of the stage. He has all the vivacity and lawlessness of imagination, all the susceptibility of the ludicrous, and all the grotesqueness of expression requisite to a respectable comedian. Even his semi-comical compositions are well-nigh inimitable; such as his description of an old horse turned out to grass; his sisters washing and combing a dirty brother; his little impatient mother washing a baby; his worm-world; sparrow-world; dog-world, etc. Thus our author exhibits himself as a natural comedian and an artistic preacher blended. The consequence is, the comedy spoils the sermon, and the sermon spoils the comedy; the water spoils the rum, and the rum spoils the water, and we have neither water nor rum, but grog. Grog, however, is a favorite beverage with many; so the "Plymouth Pulpit."

Mr. Beecher shows uncompromising hostility to many of the time-honored usages in religion, law, and government, and carries, in a practical way, his revolutionary proclivities into the domain of language. To its established laws he shows an unpardonable insubordination. Whether his offenses against the canons of speech result from bad judgment, bad taste, or the very wantonness of vanity, the reader may decide for himself. He sins against propriety. Some writers have "pet phrases." Mr. Beecher also has a troop of "pet words." *Basilar*, *elements*, *developments*, *manhood*, *experiences*, and some others, occur with disgusting frequency, and with such variability of meaning as to render the writer's idea obscure. "Basilar" belongs to anatomy, and has no right to thrust itself into sermons intended to be profitable to either common or

uncommon people. "Elements" and "developments" are used in all imaginable combinations, and even set up as lexical equivalents. "Manhood" is a whimsical little *equivogue*, thrusting itself into improper positions as a substitute for its superiors; sometimes standing in the place of "human nature," looking prim enough and proper; sometimes putting on airs of dignity, looking wondrous like Æsop's frog; sometimes assuming the attitude of "courage," looking very much like an ass in a lion's skin; sometimes putting on the robes of "piety," suggesting the idea of a wolf in sheep's clothing. "Experiences" is a greater rebel against the laws of propriety than manhood. Mr. Beecher seems to have installed it as a generic term for all the active and passive characteristics in human nature. But why use this word in the plural form? Just as appropriately may we say knowledges, consciousnesses, righteousnesses, pompousnesses, ostentatiousnesses, ridiculousnesses. The habit is ostentatious, pompous, ridiculous. Mr. Beecher also shows his lexicapnicism in the habitual use of stilted and new-fangled sentences, in which he offends against good taste and good sense. For example: "First line of true Christian duty." Are there any false Christian duties? How many lines of Christian duty are there? There must be more than one, according to our author. Are there two or ten thousand? Where do they respectively begin, what include, and where end? "In this lower or perfunctory stage of Christian experience." Our author defines "lower" by "perfunctory." We submit whether the word defined or the definition more needs a lexicographer. If these words both mean the same thing (which they do not in any proper sense), why use them both, especially as the first needs no explanation? We suspect the first was intended to represent an idea; the second, Henry Ward Beecher, an eminently proper symbol! "Working from a plane so much higher." All that Mr. B. can mean by this stilted phrase is, "acting from a better motive." But to express so plain an idea in so simple a style would be to leave the Beecher and the affectation out. "As it were." This is an obsolete form, once somewhat in vogue, but now generally condemned. It was used as a token that what followed was to be taken in a tropical sense. Mr. Beecher uses it indiscriminately in con-

nection with tropes and without them. He even uses it in his prayers. So used, it seems to be intended as a friendly warning to the Almighty to keep his ears open and guard against mistakes! Hundreds of instances of this disgusting affectation might be given. They swarm all over the pages of the "Plymouth Pulpit." By the use of such words and combinations the simplest ideas are made obscure, and the most valuable truths, worthless. They are highly offensive to good taste, and in sermons cannot fail to thwart the very ends which an earnest preacher seeks to serve. How a minister, especially an old minister, with a soul all aglow with love to God and love for perishing sinners, can so far forget the spirit of his mission, is utterly incomprehensible.

The pages of the "Pulpit" abound with solecisms—sins against concord—sins against regimen—sins against the laws of collocation. Instances might be given by the thousand, but we forbear. What right has the "Plymouth Pulpit" to flaunt its pretentious pages, all begrimed with hideous solecisms, in the face of the sermon-reading world; solecisms as offensive to literary taste as are the rank brambles and noxious weeds in Beecher's neglected garden to the eye of the economic horticulturist; solecisms which convert light into darkness, and make our great metropolitan preacher say what he does not mean—what right? Ought not the "Plymouth Pulpit" to be put under ban for indecency in dress, and as a frequent calumniator of Mr. Beecher?

Our author is an unmitigated offender against the laws of precision. His volubility is prodigious. His sentences are loaded down with a multitude of useless words. He seems to require more words to express his ideas than any other man that ever wagged tongue or pen over a proposition. The excess consists chiefly of the relational words, the connectives, which can express no idea of themselves, and are valuable in the construction of sentences only, as the cement in the construction of a wall. Some cement is necessary, but all beyond a bare sufficiency is a positive injury. About two-thirds of Mr. Beecher's word-masonry consist of mortar. We submit a few specimens: "In the first place, men have an impression that all that is necessary is, that they should watch



against temptation, and strive against easily besetting sins, and be vigilant and laborious to overcome that which is wrong." We have here a sentence of thirty-eight words. If we take out the redundant ones, retaining the general form of the sentence, it will stand thus: "In the first place, men deem it necessary only to watch against temptation, strive against easily besetting sins, and labor vigilantly to overcome what is wrong." The thirty-eight words are here reduced to twenty-six. But the sentence is still redundant. The phrase, "In the first place," is useless, there being no *second place* in the connection. Again, "to strive against besetting sins" and "labor to overcome evil," are substantially the same thing. Who can discriminate between them? The sentence, freed from its redundant words and tautological members, would stand in this form: "Men deem it necessary only to watch against temptations, and strive against easily besetting sins." Here the thirty-eight words are reduced to fifteen, and the sentence is improved in clearness and force, at a saving of over a hundred and fifty per cent of word-labor. Another: "So in the conflicts to which we are called with care and with trouble in this life, men are often overborne." This is as unpardonable for its solecisms, as for its redundancy. Does our author mean that our calling is with care and trouble, as he asserts? or does he mean that our conflicts are with care and trouble? We are called, but *men* are overborne—the first person changed to the third. His logic is certainly called to a troublesome conflict with his grammar. But the redundancy, "so," is a little falsifier, asserting a connection and a comparison which do not exist. "To which we are called" is useless. Have we any conflicts to which we are not called? or are we overcome by any which we do not have? "In this life" is useless. Do we have conflicts in any other life? The sentence, freed from its rubbish, stands thus: "We are often overcome in our conflicts by care and trouble." Twenty-one words reduced to twelve! On the same page from which the last example is taken, the following occurs: "It is when heart, and soul, and imagination, and the faith of hope and desire are concentrated, and the soul cries out, 'Lord help me,' that help comes, and is followed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost."

Heart, and soul, and imagination, and faith of hope and desire concentrated! These words are here jostled together in such illogical and absurd forms as to obscure, and even degrade, a simple and noble idea. By this choking mouthful of words, illogically combined, Mr. Beecher can mean nothing more than "the whole heart." The law of contrast suggests the Bible language, "In the day thou seekest me with the whole heart I will be found." Everybody can understand this. But Mr. Beecher's sentence would puzzle an Aristotle or a Hamilton. Yet our author seems to be in as much confusion as his readers are likely to be. He says: "Help comes, and is followed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost." What is that help, and whence comes it? Does he not believe that it comes from the Lord, and is simply the baptism or saving power of the Holy Ghost—that is, the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the help? Yet Mr. B. says that the help comes, and is followed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. His assertion, reduced to an abstract proposition, is this: the result of an act is followed by the act which produces the result. Charity inclines one to think that Mr. Beecher did not intend to perpetrate so gross an absurdity; that it is only an error in logic, resulting from his bungling manner of writing. His philosophy or his logic is sadly at fault.

Mr. Beecher, it is to be regretted, is addicted to a coarseness, even a vulgarity, inconsistent with his clerical robes. A squeamish modesty is censurable—perhaps we should say, contemptible. We admire the brave, true man who dares to vindicate the truth, not in order to show himself a blustering bully, but for the truth's sake—the man who can call things by their proper names, and rebuke wickedness as it deserves—but a preacher who is intentionally coarse, who goes out of his way to hunt up vulgarisms, loves vulgarity for its own sake, merits the reprobation of all good men. Mr. Beecher is not generally vulgar in his reproofs of wickedness. True, he sometimes calls men by hard names with soft intentions; as "dirty dogs," etc.; but this he does in such semi-comic style that the rogues feel themselves complimented rather than rebuked. Mr. Beecher most frequently offends, in this regard, in his references to women. He professes to esteem them

very highly, but he certainly delights in bringing the crimson to their faces. In one of his sermons he says: "In old times when women would have bread, they sat down to their hand-mill and worked the stones, themselves grinding; and they got by exercise the digestion which they needed for their food. And that was a great deal better than starving." This is one of our author's peculiar illustrations of what everybody very well knows without an elaborate illustration; that is, that men may act from different motives, as mills may be run with different motive powers. The two last members of the sentence are purely gratuitous, having not the remotest connection with the subject. What could digestion or starvation, in the case referred to, have to do with the question of religious motives? But, pertinent or not pertinent, our preacher will have his audience and readers drop the subject in hand, and take a glance, not at the abstract subject of digestion, but at a concrete example in the case of these women. Did the preacher expect to enlighten anybody by this display of his taste? He wanted a sensation, and got it, of course. But if Mr. Beecher must needs sharpen up occasionally the appetites of his audience with a dish of coarseness, he should at least season it with a slight infusion of common sense. He says that these women wanted bread; but, instead of bread, he gives them digestion. If he had said, "They got by exercise the food they needed," he would have displayed good sense, and left out the vulgarity. He chose, however, to leave out the sense and retain the vulgarity. In the same sermon Mr. Beecher, still dwelling on the motives of human action, personates a "little, impatient mother," and exclaims: "'Let me wash my own babe.' Since it is the first and the only one, it is the most admirable of all created things. 'Let me do it.' And yet, methinks, about four years ago, when this maiden was requested to do that very act, she snarled her pretty face, because it was so disagreeable and tedious washing a babe that was squirming, and running, and full of playful ugliness. But now that it is her child, she will not let anybody wash it for her." A fine display of pulpit oratory, pulpit dignity, pulpit grace, pulpit unction! Mr. Beecher, as usual, sets off his rhetoric with a solecism. Did Mr. Beecher *think* "about four years ago"? or was the maiden

requested to wash the baby "about four years ago"? The objectionable features of this pen-picture have no more pertinency to the subject under consideration than has digestion in the preceding example. It is another case hunted up to bring the color to modest faces. An old lady, thirty years a Church member, on reading this passage, closed the book, and has not looked into the "Pulpit" since, and probably never will again. But have not little, impatient mothers a right to wash their squirming babies? Certainly, but not in the church, where hundreds are convened for religious worship; nor has Mr. Beecher any right to dramatize such scenes in the pulpit. Take the example from page 341, Vol. IV.: "It has been supposed that we sprang from monkeys; and there has been an inquisition to see if a caudal appendage has not been rubbed off. Nations have been explored to find a man who had a tail as a monkey has, or some traces of one. You are looking in the wrong place!" This does not admit of comment farther than to state that it is embellished with two solecisms: the first the wrong form of the verb, and the second a change of the leading subject. The first is apparently unintentional, the second apparently designed to give point to the vulgarity. "Nations have been explored," etc., but "you [his audience] are looking," etc. Is this a true picture, or only a hideous caricature of that religion which is intended not less to refine the heart than to enlighten the understanding?

Thus far our attention has been given chiefly to our author's style, his grammar, rhetoric, etc. These, to him, may appear to be small matters—quite beneath the notice of "eminently great men." Certainly they are little things—so are sparrows. Is it not characteristic of eminent greatness to be observant of little things? Decency in style of composition is as much a virtue as decency in dress. The man is to be pitied who is too great to be decent.

Let us now briefly notice Mr. Beecher as he majestically moves along on some of his "higher planes of development," amid the sublime mysteries of philosophy. He generally disparages, sometimes almost denounces, philosophy as an incumbrance, rather than a help, to religion. This may be because, like Dr. Wayland, he can understand nobody's phi-

losophy but his own. It is certainly unfortunate for him that nobody can understand it but himself. Be this as it may, we have no knowledge of any preacher who attempts so frequently to play the philosopher as Mr. Beecher. That department of metaphysics for which he seems to have the greatest *penchant* and the least capacity, is what is known as psychology. Affecting to fathom, to the full extent of human possibility, all the profound mysteries of human nature, he indulges himself, to his own infinite satisfaction and to the utter bewilderment of his readers, in his peculiar strains of philosophizing. The following specimen is found on pages 336-7. Our author is laboring to show that God's mercy, in order to save us, must be received by us, and how it is to be received. He says: "But our profit in this amnesty, or gift, must come as all benefit of the soul comes; that is, by our accepting it. The proffer does not bring profit—the realization does. Thus we take physical things by our physical organs. If they are presented to us, we possess them only when we have received them, in the way in which physical things, material things, can be taken. When intellectual things are presented to us (ideas, for instance, and new truths, or inflections of old ones), they are of no validity, and of no use, and of no significance to us, as long as our intellect, being dead, does not rise up to receive them. A man presented with the most astonishing discoveries, written out in a book which he cannot read, has, in some sense, a gift of knowledge presented to him; but it is of no use to him, simply because his intellect cannot receive it under such conditions. If the gift is material, you must accept it as material gifts are accepted. If the gift be intellectual, it must be conferred and received as intellectual gifts are conferred and received. If the gift be emotive, then it must appeal to the sensibility of reciprocal emotion; as if one confer confidence, or affection, or friendship, that is received only when a corresponding warmth of affection rises up to take it and to realize it. And the generosity, the life, the goodness, the loving-kindness, the long-suffering of God—these can be received by us only through some corresponding spiritual sensibility. And although they are ours in one sense, in another sense they never avail for us until, in some manner,

we take them home to ourselves. This is what is meant by our receiving the free grace of God by faith."

Will the reader, after catching his breath, read this extract again, and study it sufficiently to realize the darkness in it? This is a fair specimen of Mr. Beecher's grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, and theology. The grammar is by no means the best—just one-half dozen solecisms; the rhetoric is a wordy jumble; the philosophy, a medley; and the theology an absurdity. The simple proposition with which Mr. Beecher sets out, when taken down from its stilts, is, that the offer of salvation will not save us, unless it is received—a proposition so plain that it may be accepted as self-evident. He then, by an indirect method of philosophizing, shows how that salvation is received.

Let us now examine his method. Our author, sometimes confounding terms that are radically different, sometimes discriminating between those that are substantially equivalent, and sometimes using ambiguous words in different senses, confuses himself, and, in his hopeless bewilderment, mistakes his own foolish conceits for lucid demonstrations. He generally demonstrates by analogy! A capital error in this case is his confounding the words "offer" and "gift," the former denoting the purpose, the latter the act resulting from that purpose, and, in some instances, conditioned upon the disposition of another party. Another source of confusion is his use of the word "presented" in a variable sense—sometimes an "offer," and sometimes a "gift." The reader may see these statements verified by studying the extract. Mr. Beecher says: "The proffer does not bring profit; the realization does." A few sentences below, he puts "to realize" as a sequence "to receive;" and certainly realization is the reception or the inseparable sequence of reception, and in either case does not bring profit, but is the profit itself. It is simply absurd to talk of a gift bringing itself. He proceeds: "Thus we take physical things by [with] our physical organs." Yes, the child understands that it must take the bread with its hands, not with its mind. Valuable learning, this! Further: "If they are presented to us, we possess them only when we have received them in the way in which physical things, material



things, can be received." It is difficult, if not impossible, for one to find a proposition more overgorged with nonsense than is this. It scarcely admits of a decent criticism. The reader may try it in every possible way; and, after all, it comes to this luminous truism: *When we have a thing, we have received it in some possible way.* But who ever suspected that men receive things in an impossible way? Cannot our metropolitan philosopher come down, at least occasionally, from his "higher planes of development" among the clouds to the plane of common sense, and say concretely, If an apple is offered to us, we receive it with the hand? A child can understand this, and can plainly express it, which is more than our philosopher seems able to do. Again: "When intellectual things are presented to us . . . they are of no . . . use to us as long as our intellect, being dead, does not rise up to receive them." Well, this is prodigiously profound, and quite satisfactory! But what demented man in Christendom ever thought of offering bread to a dead man, or ideas to a dead intellect? Can Mr. Beecher present intellectual things to things without intellect—to a worm or a toad? If he can, how astonishing it is that the toad does not rise up to receive the impossible present! A dead intellect is a contradiction in terms. More of the same sort: "A man presented with the most astonishing discoveries, written out in a book which he cannot read, has, in some sense, a gift of knowledge presented to him; but it is of no use to him, simply because his intellect cannot receive it under such conditions." Mr. Beecher has here either attempted to befog his readers, or has completely stultified himself by discriminating between "a man" and "his intellect," and by confounding "the most astonishing discoveries," "a gift of knowledge," and "a book." His proposition, freed from its involutions, is, that a man receives a gift of knowledge in the form of discoveries written in a book which he cannot read; but the intellect cannot receive it, and it is of course of no use to him. The thing is an unmitigated paradox. Neither the man nor the intellect, if we must discriminate between things incapable of separation, receives any gift of knowledge; the book may be received, but it is not itself a knowledge of the discoveries, though these are written in the

book. This is Mr. Beecher's hook on which to hang responsibility—natural ability a sufficient ground for moral accountability! A poor man is starving. Mr. Beecher, with cruel kindness, presents to him a profusion of flowers, saying: "There is an abundance of honey in these flowers. If you will extract it and eat it, your life will be saved." The poor man dies, and Mr. Beecher appears before a coroner's jury and testifies that the man died of perverseness, and not for the want of food, he himself having presented to the man an abundance of wholesome diet. Fie on such gifts! and fie on the heart and brain that manufacture such airy things! Our philosopher proceeds: "If the gift is material, you must accept it as material gifts are accepted. If the gift be intellectual, it must be conferred and received as intellectual gifts are conferred and received." Profound philosophizing, this! and immensely valuable, too, it might become to us poor animals, favored with only a slight amount of rationality, if we, at some ill-starred hour, should happen to be so far bereft, both of interest and reason, as to attempt to appropriate our food with the fingers of fancy, and to digest it in the laboratory of the mind instead of the stomach. The lesson might be equally valuable if, from some empirical whim, we should attempt, by mere digital manipulation, so to enlarge our intellectual calibers as to be able to chamber Beecherian philosophy. Again: "If the gift be emotive, then it must appeal to the sensibility of reciprocal emotion." Thanks for such luminosity! Everybody now may know how emotive gifts are received! Sensibility and emotion are related as are will and volition. The latter is simply an exercise of the former. An emotive gift is something that moves the sensibility or produces emotion. Now, this emotive gift which produces emotion, must appeal to (or be received by) the sensibility of a corresponding emotion. This is equivalent to saying that a volition must appeal to the will of a reciprocal volition, or that a volition can be put forth only by the will of reciprocal volition. Now that Mr. Beecher has laid down the law, volitions and emotions must understand that they henceforth must either produce themselves, or not exist at all. But our philosopher kindly furnishes us with an illustration: "As if one confers confi-

dence, or affection, or friendship, that is received only when a corresponding warmth of affection rises up to take it and to realize it." We have here rather less of the abstract, but if possible, more of the darkness; at least the darkness is made more palpable. This philosophy makes friendship, and all other emotive gifts, as Mr. Beecher calls them, simply impossible. Having cleared away the darkness, he now applies his philosophy to his theology. He says: "The generosity, the life, the goodness, the loving-kindness, the long-suffering of God—these can be received by us only through some corresponding spiritual sensibility." The broad, unqualified proposition, taken in its natural construction, is false, utterly false. This Mr. Beecher himself concedes when, in the next sentence, he says: "They [the generosity, etc.] are ours in one sense." What he intended to say, perhaps, is, that the Divine favor can be received by us in a saving sense only through some corresponding spiritual sensibility. This is the capital point in his philosophy and in his theology. But is his method of investing men with saving grace the true method? Let us see. If we can receive saving grace only through a corresponding spiritual sensibility, then, of course, it can be given only in the same way; for it is a mere truism to say that God can do a thing only in the way in which it can be done. God, then, it is clear, can give saving grace only through a corresponding spiritual sensibility in the sinner. But the sinner has no such sensibility, and, consequently, according to Mr. Beecher's method, he cannot, while in that state, receive, nor can God give him, saving grace; and the salvation of the sinner is plainly impossible unless he can be in some manner possessed of this sensibility. How is this to be obtained? He cannot create it himself; as easily could a dead body revitalize itself. There is then certainly no help from human power. But cannot God himself give this corresponding spiritual sensibility, and thus render the reception of saving grace not only possible, but certain, and even necessary? This is just what Mr. Beecher believes, and means to teach. Let us look into it a little. If this is true, then it is certain God has given, and the sinner has received, a great favor without any corresponding sensibility. This favor, it will be

readily admitted, is either the antecedent and preparative of saving grace, or it is saving grace itself, or its immediate and inevitable result. If it is not saving grace, nor the effects, but only the preparative, as Mr. Beecher teaches, then the inquiry is—

1. With what condition of saving grace does it correspond? (Mr. Beecher says it is corresponding) with grace in the sinner's heart, or out of it?

2. Is it not just as possible for God to give saving grace without the intervention of a corresponding sensibility, as it is to give this corresponding sensibility without the intervention of antecedent sensibility, and consequently just as possible for the sinner to receive saving grace without a corresponding sensibility?

3. If the reception of saving grace by the sinner requires a previous preparation in the form of corresponding sensibilities, does not this preparation itself require a previous preparation in the same form, involving the absurdity of an infinite series of antecedents and sequences?

4. Does not this spiritual sensibility afford to the consciousness the only possible evidence of saving grace in the heart?

5. Is it possible for a man to have these sensibilities and yet not be a subject of saving grace? Or, if a man having them should die, would he be saved or lost? Every one of these points, as the reader will readily see, proves conclusively that Mr. Beecher's corresponding spiritual sensibilities is saving grace itself, or the evidence of it. His philosophy involves the absurdity of teaching that a thing is the condition of its own existence; or that we cannot receive saving grace except through saving grace, or that we cannot receive it at all.

It is perhaps a little unkind to hold Mr. Beecher to a strict accountability for the evil tendencies of his philosophy. His philosophy is less at fault than his philosophizing. The reckless boy that ventures upon impracticable waters is censurable, not for being drowned, but for attempting a thing beyond his capacity. Mr. Beecher always drowns himself when he ventures upon the sea of metaphysical speculation. Other passages have been marked, upon which it was intended to comment; but space here will not permit. It may not be

improper to remark that Mr. Beecher is generally led by his metaphysics into the profoundest depths of fatalism; still, the charge is not made that he is intentionally a fatalist. It is not easy to determine what he is; and, judging from his sermons, he does not know himself!

Mr. Beecher's practical theology is, if possible, worse than his theoretical. Without pretending to a very accurate classification, it is proposed to notice a few most pernicious errors. He proclaims himself a higher law progressionist. On page 342, Vol. IV., he says: "And things that in a lower stage were not wrong and were not felt to be wrong, become so by the development of men. It is quite folly to reason back five or three thousand years ago, and say these things existed then and were not condemned. A thing that five hundred years ago, or one hundred years ago, was a matter of indifference, has come to be a matter of wrong simply because men have changed their relations to it." This seems to us to be nothing less than rank treason against Heaven. The Bible rule of rectitude obsolete, superannuated, superseded!!—and that by what men *feel* to be right or wrong, "by the development of men, and because men have changed their relations to it"! The doctrine is boldly avowed that men change, and truth and right change with them. Let it be granted that the human reason, or human conscience, or human nature in some of its attributes, is capable of determining in every possible instance what is right and what wrong; let it be farther granted that the Bible, as a standard of moral rectitude, is of no authority, only so far as its revelations are affirmed "by the developments of men," the feeling, reason, or conscience; let these teachings once take hold upon the public mind; then will infidelity, in every form, irreligion, and Jacobinism sweep this country as with a besom of destruction. All theories and dogmas that disparage the authority of the Bible and exalt the human faculties as a sufficient guide in morals and religion tend, directly and inevitably, to infidelity and practical irreligion; or rather these dogmas, unblushingly put forth by Mr. Beecher, are the essence of infidelity. Every intelligent infidel believes a thousand truths contained in the Bible, but claims to credit them not on the authority of the

Bible, but upon the testimony of his own reason, etc. Mr. Beecher assumes to know, independently of the Bible, what is right and what is wrong; also to know, with certainty, when a thing once right becomes wrong. Which is the more dangerous enemy to Christ, Judas or Herod?

Mr. Beecher, in complete harmony with the dogmas which he avows in the foregoing, does not believe Christianity to be in any true sense—not even in the fundamental principle of right—a fixed science. Let him speak for himself, on page 386, Vol. III.—“That the term Christian faith signifies the possibilities of the human soul under the divine guidance of God and inspiration; . . . the unaltered parts of Christianity; the undeveloped truths of Christianity, which are to come through human hearts and human life, I fain would believe are the major part.” Believing himself to be one of those men whom God calls “to be spiritual leaders—men adapted to this higher stage of Christian development—men born to it, . . . men of wondrous insight, and intuition, and glory, . . . men that ought to rule the world,” Mr. Beecher readily accepts the visions of a distempered brain as the revelations of a divinity within him. To him the Bible is a book of the past, whose moral precepts were of much value to the ancient, but now superseded, forms of civilization, but which are at this time of no authority, only so far as they may be reëffirmed by this divinity that speaks “through human hearts and human life.” “Hence,” he continues, “whatever the soul comes to, whatever it gains, or legitimately develops under the divine guidance and influence, is a part of Christianity.” We have been accustomed to look for a large increase in the volume of Christian influence, but no addition to the volume of revealed truth. We have been accustomed to believe the whole of Christianity to consist of the truths contained in the Bible, and Christian experience to consist in the effects of these truths on the human mind. We have not been accustomed to identify a tree and its fruit, a man and his acts, God and his works, or the truths of Christianity and their effects. Nor have we thought it quite proper to call the fruit of a tree a part of the tree, the acts of a man a part of the man, the works of God a part of



God, or the effects of Christian truth a part of Christianity. If we are to accept the alleged Christian experience of every man, whether Christian, fanatic, knave, or fool, as a part of Christianity, what a disgusting hotch-potch we would have! The ravings of one Beecher, if accepted as a veritable part of our Christianity, are enough to putrify the whole, and make our holy religion a stench in the nostrils of the world. But if we must accept the ravings of ten thousand Beechers as integral parts of Christianity, then the muddled mass will become an intolerable curse to the world. The heat generated by the friction of the impinging parts would fire and consume the world. No form of infidelity ever propagated is more destructive to every interest of Church or State than these Beecherian dogmæ—all the more insidious and the more dangerous, because put forth by a popular preacher, and in the interest of a higher form of Christian experience.

It may be well now briefly to notice the means by which Mr. Beecher proposes to repress evil and advance justice, truth, and religion; that is, his notions of evil, justice, truth, and religion. In his sermon on "War," pages 342-3, he says: "You (Mr. Beecher speaks as if the Plymouth Church, with himself at its head, were intrusted with the administration of the world) never can have peace until you love justice so much that you insist upon it that there shall be justice; then you will have peace. But men who see nations ground into the dust and do not feel that; men who see servile classes whose very natures are almost wiped out, and do not feel enough about that to be disturbed; men who see human nature prostituted, abused, and tyrants wiping their feet on God's precious souls, and do not think it wrong, but think that peace is far more precious than human nature, human life, and human growth—these are the very men who make war. Palliatives to tyranny are provocatives to war. And he is recreant, who says 'Peace' (Jesus said 'Peace'), so long as there are these great fundamental, organic evils unrectified, for which there is no peace. God will not give peace where there is not purity. Therefore let those who want peace, preach for it, and labor for it, and hope for it, as an indispensable means to it. Let them begin to rectify abuses. Let

them take sides with the weak, and see to it that justice prevails among men who are deprived of their rights. Give no peace to the earth till righteousness prevails, and *then* you will take the shortest cut to universal peace." It is not necessary to examine this remarkable "blood and thunder" proclamation in detail, or trace its utterances to their full logical results. Every sentence is in some sense false—false in its literature, false in its logic, false in its assumption, false in its morality, or false in its religious spirit. Its whole tendency is diabolical. It is justice, however, to Mr. Beecher to state that he is a bold advocate of peace—universal peace; but, like every demon war-spirit that has deluged the earth with effusions of blood, he will tolerate peace only on *conditions*—conditions of his own dictation. Any tyrant, even his Satanic majesty, could very well afford to be at peace on such terms. But, if he cannot have peace on his own terms, then he is for war—war in the name of the God of peace and a peaceful religion. No war-monster on earth ever put forth a proclamation bloodier than this of Henry Ward Beecher—bloodier in terms, in forms of utterance, it may have been, but not in principle or in fact. Only in the briefest manner can the extent of this Christian (?) war policy, its assumptions and tendencies, be noticed here. Mr. Beecher proclaims war by fire and sword, and what not, against all the injustice, oppression, and unrighteousness in every form found in the "fundamental, organic" laws of civil governments; in the laws of Church governments; in the principles of all sorts of human associations; in the conventional laws of every form of human society; in the principles, faith, and habits of individuals, and wherever injustice or unrighteousness may happen to exist. Is he crazy, or is he only playing the clown for the amusement of his audience? Is he in earnest, or only gasconading? If in earnest, he is now ready to arm himself, or perhaps arm only the Christian world, and hurl its sacramental battalions against the fundamental and organic evils of the nations. Such is the extent of Mr. Beecher's war policy. The assumptions on which it rests are not less pretentious, nor less ridiculous. First, it is plainly and broadly assumed that Henry Ward Beecher, or some one man, or

some junta, or clique, has the right or power of determining, with unerring exactness, in every possible instance, what is right and what is wrong in all the relations that men sustain to each other, and to their Creator. Secondly, it is plainly and broadly assumed, that Henry Ward Beecher, or some one man, or some junta, or clique, has the right, by fire and sword, and what not, to compel righteousness and repress all injustice in this world. Omniscience alone is able to do what Mr. Beecher urges his Plymouth Church to do.

By the way, where does this modern Mahomet get his authority for making his conscience the standard of universal rectitude, and for propagating his conceptions of righteousness by fire and sword. Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world." The spirit of Mr. Beecher's proclamation is that Christ was either mistaken, or that "the nations have gone on growing so," that what was then wrong has now become right; that then, when Christians moved on the lower planes of development and worked with "the basilar faculties," the weapons of their warfare were not carnal, but spiritual and mighty, through God; but now, when Christians move on the higher stages, the weapons of their warfare ought to be carnal and mighty, through "the pomp of glorious war." This is not quite satisfactory. Peter had a little of the Beecher in him, when he drew his sword and cut off Malchus's ear. Peter struck in self-defense. Mr. Beecher strikes offensively. Christ rebuked his disciple, saying, "Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." This took all the Beecher out of Peter. Christ certainly did not know that it ever would come to be right to defend, much less to propagate, righteousness by the sword.

Mr. Beecher condemns the Pope as bigoted, intolerant, unjust, cruel. Now, these two illustrious personages, much as they may differ in many respects, stand on the same ground. They both acknowledge the same God, and claim to be, in some extraordinary sense, his priests. They both accept the Bible, yet both claim a knowledge superior to its teachings; they both are seized, like Robespierre, of an offensive conscience, which they both direct and follow, making it the standard of universal rectitude, and scruple not at the use of

whatever means may seem necessary to execute its selfish behests. They both claim to be men, yet aspire to the place of God; they both concede a moral power in the gospel, yet both look to carnal weapons as the bulwark of their religion. Could they meet, each with half the armies of the earth at his command, they would deluge the nations with blood, both alike waging war for righteousness' sake. Their theories are equally and inherently antagonistic to all civil liberty, all religious liberty, and with neither of them can there be peace when they may have power to make war.

Mr. Beecher, as a writer, has many unpardonable faults; still there is a charm, a fascination in his writings, resulting from his comic wit and the vagaries of his lawless imagination; but, like the adder, he first charms, then stings his victim—charms with his style, and stings with the poison of his false theories. His higher law theory is the quintessence of nonsense. Its inevitable tendency is to universal infidelity and irreligion. His war policy for the establishment of universal peace is simply treason against civil government, treason against God, treason against the spirituality of religion, and treason against religious liberty.

---

---

ART. IX.—*Mutability of Moral Distinctions.*

MORALITY implies action—voluntary action. It is a living thing, acting in conformity to moral law. If an act bear a certain relation to this law, the habitual and voluntary performance of it constitutes morality. But if it bear a certain other relation to law, the habitual and voluntary performance constitutes immorality. This relation is fixed and invariable. The law is eternal and immutable as God is, because it is couched in his very nature, constituting a part of himself. It does not depend upon an expression of arbitrary will; it is only a part of God manifested; and this part could not possibly be manifested otherwise than it is. The good is not good to-day and evil to-morrow. If it be good, it is good

necessarily and universally. If it be wrong for one person to commit fraud, it is wrong for another. If it be wrong in this world, it is wrong in another. If it be good for one to live in conformity with the obligations under which he is placed, it is good for another. If it be good in this world, it is good in every other world. It is so absolutely, and not simply because God willed it. He willed it because he could not will otherwise. He has no more power to make good evil, and evil good, than he has to change his own nature. He cannot un-God himself. What he is now he has been from eternity. He is, therefore, *necessarily* what he is. God, for example, cannot make a triangle without imparting to it the property that the sum of its angles shall be equal to two right angles. This is one of the elements constituting the nature of a triangle. If it did not possess this element, it could not be a triangle. So it is with the good. It cannot differ in the least from what it is, and be good.

Now morality, when applied to human conduct and human thoughts and feelings, is that which is in accordance with the good. It is one of the fundamental conditions of thought that a thing cannot be and not be at the same time. Neither can a thing possess two contradictory properties at the same time. They would, of course, destroy each other, and be equivalent to no property at all. Morality, therefore, cannot be that which bears a certain relation to eternal and absolute good, and, at the same time, be that which does not bear such relation. It is either morality, or it is nothing. Hence, there is in it no more mutability than there is in the immutable principles of goodness which lie at its basis. In order that conduct, thought, feeling, may be moral, there must not, therefore, be any thing in them that is variable or in opposition to these principles, any more than there is in religion which is the perfection of morality. One act may, indeed, differ from another, and both may have stamped upon them the character of virtuous acts. So with two or more thoughts or emotions. But though these acts, thoughts, or emotions be different, they are, in some respects, alike, inasmuch as they bear the same relation to the unchangeable standard.

Extraneous influences and circumstances there are which

may, and indeed often do, so operate as to change this relation of an act to the standard by which it is to be tested, without changing the act itself. Homicide is a great crime, but not always. It may be committed accidentally or in self-defense. To drink intoxicating liquor is an immoral act, but it may not always be so. There may be cases in which it is necessary to the preservation of life. Again, it is evident that circumstances of such a nature may so gather about us as to deprive us of all personal liberty. It cannot be supposed that one is responsible for what may be done under such circumstances; for where there is no liberty there can be no accountability, and where there is no accountability there can be neither morality nor immorality. Our criminal law recognizes the distinction between manslaughter and murder in the first degree, and fixes the penalty in proportion to the crime, while it takes no cognizance of the same act if it be accidental. It is evident, therefore, that the motive which prompts to action must be considered before we can determine the relation which the action bears to the immutable good.

This absolute and immutable good, shown forth in the expressions of the Divine will, does not, however, always and everywhere, constitute the standard by which the virtue or vice of an action is determined. Hence the mutability of moral distinctions. Each sect of philosophers has established its criterion. According to one, it is happiness or utility; and, therefore, whatever tends to increase one's happiness, or subserves one's interest, may be done with impunity and without remorse. According to another, if to perform a certain action will be to the interest of the State, it is right that it should be performed. This is a substitution of policy for principle; and it is on this ground that acts of military necessity are justified. That which conflicts with justice—or, to speak generally, the good—cannot be right, because the good is inflexible, and cannot be made to accommodate itself to all sorts of circumstances. On the other hand, certain sensational philosophers, confounding will and desire, have rushed to the conclusion that in sentiment alone is involved the principle of morality. It is easily perceived to what confusion



such an idea leads; for, admitting it to be true, nothing is either good or evil but as it is believed to be so. For one person to perform a certain act is moral; for another to perform the same act is immoral, and *vice versa*. If, in the performance of a certain act by any one, my sympathies are awakened so that I desire his success, then to me that is a virtuous act. We may congratulate ourselves, however, upon the assurance that the good and the evil are not such flexible things, and that humanity has something really immutable to which it may attach its hopes.

The effect of the various views promulgated by ethical writers, is illustrated in the politics of nations, as well as in the morals of individuals. When those views become long established and popular opinions, they constitute custom; and then the voice of ages becomes the voice of God. The ancient Anglo-Saxons practiced piracy, until piracy became with them a national virtue. The ancient Scandinavians indulged in war, until to die for their country was sweet and glorious, and the only way to secure for themselves an entrance into the hall of Valhalla. The morality or immorality of an age or nation is often that which simply conforms, or does not conform, to its customs. Considered in this sense, morality becomes a taste, and its distinctions are mutable, varying with custom, or as time and place vary. The ancient Greeks could not possibly have been induced to devour the bodies of their dead; while the ancient Indians could not possibly have been induced to refrain from devouring theirs. The custom of each was his morality, and each considered that of the other as something sacrilegious. At one time in England a man was condemned by the voice of the people, and burned, for refusing to perform certain petty ceremonies connected with the Roman Catholic Church. In a succeeding age, in the same nation, a man was condemned and burned for adhering to the same rite, for the neglect of which his predecessor had died at the stake. Three hundred years ago a man was denounced as a heretic, and condemned to die, for believing that which now constitutes a fundamental doctrine of every Christian Church. In one age and country it is deemed an exhibition of daring manhood and sublime contempt of death for a man to take

his own life; in another age and country it is considered a species of murder no less heinous and disgraceful than taking the life of another. The Puritans were driven from England by religious persecution. In America the same horrid acts were perpetrated by themselves, and they thought they were doing God's service. Human belief is a very variable thing; and when it, together with the systems of philosophers, is made the criterion of morality, inconsistency and confusion are the inevitable result. This, however, has often been the case. Hence, there is at least a germ of truth in the following expression of the celebrated Pascal: "As fashion makes comfort, so does she also make justice. . . . Nothing, according to pure reason, is just in itself. Custom makes equity; by this alone is it received; this is the mystic foundation of its authority. Whoever reduces it to its principles destroys it; justice is that which we are forced to observe."

According to Hobbs, one of England's skeptical philosophers, there is no temperance, no justice, no chastity, and, indeed, no virtue, where there is no human enactment. Neither sensuality, nor any other vice, is wrong, unless it be prohibited by a special law. This system came down from antiquity. It had its advocates, and worked evil as it came. How could morality be otherwise than variable, when its distinctions are made to depend upon such variable causes? It was on this principle that Macaulay attempted to extenuate the guilt and ignominy attached to the name of Nicholas Machiavelli. On the same principle, we may account for the remarkable want of honor and regard for truth manifested by the nations of Southern Europe a few centuries after the downfall of the Roman empire; likewise for the bigotry of the Dark Ages, and for the extreme malice manifested toward the reformers of science as well as of religion. Let the doctrines of Machiavelli be what they may, but let them be tried by the code of his age, and they may not, according to it, be found extremely heterodox. We cannot censure him for not transcending the established system of belief; but, if he had so acted, he certainly would have been a bold adventurer, and worthy of immortality. Duplicity and dishonesty were national characteristics during the seventh and eighth centu-

ries after the Christian era. They were the prevailing *fashions* of the age, and were regarded rather as national virtues. No one man was responsible for them; nor, indeed, may we say that any one nation was. They had been formed gradually, and had been handed down with a constant increase, as a birthright. The authority of more than one man was required to remodel the scientific, political, and moral codes of that age, as well as of the ages succeeding. Before mankind will submit to innovation, they must be convinced that conservatism is error. It is a fact of history, and of observation, too, that isolated persons cannot effect a revolution. Abortive, immature efforts they may make, but they must always result in failure. A true revolution must be gradual, a movement *en masse*. Revolutions are sometimes necessary; but, as has been truly said, "Woe to that revolutionist who is not himself a creature of the revolution." The German, Schiller, illustrates the power of long-established opinions when he says:

Out of the common is man's nature framed,  
And custom is the nurse to whom he cleaves;

And

There is a consecrating power in time,  
And what is gray with years to man is god-like.

Another reason why erroneous habits of thought and systems of belief sometimes take such firm hold on the mind, lies in man's social nature. He will assimilate himself to the character and adopt the habits of those with whom he is constantly associated. History gives an account of but one Noah. Even if there were others, they would be exceptions, and could not prove the invalidity of the rule. Socrates was, perhaps, the only Grecian philosopher who had the courage to die for the sake of his philosophy. But Socrates was not alone in his faith; he had his adherents. The very fact that different creeds have had their martyrs, is illustrative of that other fact—the power of custom. Man is a gregarious animal, and each one of the herd clings with tenacity to the habits of the herd. Alexander the Great had a crooked neck; all his courtiers must, therefore, have crooked necks too. A great man, like Voltaire, or Frederic of Prussia, ridicules Christianity. The little men must do so too, and a French

revolution ensues. "While in Rome do as Rome does," is a trite saying; but it is, nevertheless, founded on a great principle of human nature. Had we lived in the days when the Pantheon stood in its splendor, we would, perhaps, have been as devout worshipers of the ten thousand deities as the most devout Roman was. This is an evil, perhaps. It is indeed one, when converted into personal and national prejudice. But it is an evil not due to morality; for morality proper has no distinctions—at least, no variable ones. In some of its manifestations it is calculated to embarrass the mind that is conscious of it, but, at the same time, is unable to account for it. It is an evil in the constitution itself of man. It is not an original one, but one grafted into it. This grafting is, however, the result of an original susceptibility of human nature to this evil; and it has reference, not only to man's moral nature, but bears a relation also to his intellect. We know that *mind* is *mind*; and we know, moreover, that it is, in some sense, a unit. The essence of a mind lodged in one body is the same as the essence of a mind lodged in another body. The faculties and capacities of one mind are common to all other minds. But they think differently; and every thought conceived, every opinion entertained, every latent mental energy which has been developed into an activity, becomes a part or modification of mind, and cannot be annihilated. Hence, every opinion changed, and every thought which conflicts with another thought, becomes so many distortions of mind. These mental distortions often influence the heart, for the mind and the heart often act in unison. Hence the various systems of ethics, which have been promulgated by as many different philosophers, and the various standards erected, to which human conduct and human thoughts and feelings must be referred, in order that it may be ascertained whether they be moral or immoral.

Humanity recognizes this as an evil, and, in the vain hope of redeeming itself, has ever struggled against it. History points out prominent indications of the effort. What is every seemingly sudden outburst of public opinion, every great revolution which completely changes the phase of society—sometimes ingrafting an entirely new faith into the mind—but a

stupendous and long-generated effort of humanity to break the "icy chains of custom," and to reestablish its moral and political systems on the basis of the divine moral law? Humanity may not always be conscious of this, nor may the end desired be, in every case, attained. But when a revolution results in something worse than that which produced it, the perturbations continue, and another revolution ensues. Humanity can, indeed, help itself, but it cannot redeem itself; for the evil still exists, and will continue to exist, until the gradual workings of a higher principle, or some immediate and supernatural agency, effect a redemption. More than two thousand years ago custom was called the Queen of the World. She still rules—her title undisputed—and morality, especially national morality, is still recognized as her offspring.

But may we not, at least, convert this evil into an incidental good? Was not Macaulay justified in his attempt to extenuate the ignominy of Machiavelli? Was he not justified on the ground of a reasonable charity, as well as on the ground of a still deeper principle of human nature itself? The same principle should operate in regard to minor cases. Should we not look with a degree of leniency upon those whose notions and opinions are different from our own? They are no more responsible for their opinions than we are for some which we entertain. Their formation, in part, may be due to hoary-headed custom, or they may be handed down by ancestry, forming a constitutional peculiarity over which the mind has no control. They are heirlooms hung up in the heart to perpetuate the memory of the past. We, too, have our heirlooms; and, if we look upon ours with leniency, and wish others to do so, we must reverse the process, and look upon theirs in the same manner. Every man has in his bosom an altar whereon burns the fire sacred to the Penates. We must not desecrate that altar, nor accuse him of sacrilege who sends up from it invisible incense to the spirit of his fathers.

ART. X.—*The Church—its Strength.*

STRENGTH and vigor are necessary elements in the growth of things physical, intellectual, and spiritual. That the Church has had its summer and its winter none can deny. Its growth has not been measured and regular at all times, nor in all generations. In the apostolic day the increase was, perhaps, more rapid than it has ever been since. On the day of Pentecost three thousand were added to the Church. A few days after that the number of the disciples was put down at five thousand. In the age of the apostles the gospel spread over a considerable part of Asia, a large part of Europe, and, doubtless, no inconsiderable part of Northern Africa. The growth of particular and local Churches was not less remarkable than that of the Church in general. Mr. Gibbon saw, in preparing his history of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," that this remarkable fact must be accounted for, or the world would be compelled to acknowledge that the Christian religion was from Heaven. He undertook to give reasons for its spread. If any man in all past history was able to give reasons for its success, while leaving out of consideration its claims to divinity, surely Mr. Gibbon was that man; and yet he has most certainly failed to account for such mighty results. Indeed they cannot be accounted for under any other hypothesis than that the Christian religion is from heaven. So far, "the gates of hell have not prevailed" against the Church. It is earnestly and confidently believed that they never will. It is hardly possible for the gospel to be tried by a severer ordeal than that through which it has already passed. "Walk, therefore, about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following." (Psl. xlviii.)

Let us take a survey of *our* Jerusalem, and see if we can find wherein the real strength of a Church lies. It may be in those things that the world would least suspect—even in things as insignificant, apparently, as a lock of hair. In this investigation let us begin with looking at the subject in a negative point of view.



1. The strength of a Church does not consist in mere orthodoxy. Many, with much of the theory of religion, know little of its practice, and nothing of its experience. Hence there are many orthodox sinners. They accept the great fundamental principles of Christianity; they acknowledge one God, one Divine Mediator, and one Divine Spirit; they admit the depravity of our nature, the necessity of repentance, faith, justification, regeneration; and yet they maintain no vital union with Christ. The "head may be converted," and the man still remain unchanged. One is not a real Christian till both head and heart are brought to Christ. It is of the utmost importance to have a correct doctrinal basis; and no Church can be pure, or *permanently* (perhaps I should say finally) successful, without it. Yet this is not every thing to the Church.

2. The strength of a Church does not consist wholly in its numerical superiority. It is not strong in proportion to its numbers, unless God be with it and in it. Oftentimes the few are mightier than the many. Gideon, in the name and by the power of God, with his three hundred chosen men, discomfited and put to flight the numberless thousands of the army of Midian. See what the few disciples, made strong by prayer and ten days' communion with God, accomplished in a single day, under Peter's sermon, on the day of Pentecost. Numbers are not to be despised; but the victory is not always to the strong, nor the race to the swift.

3. The strength of a Church does not lie wholly in a learned ministry. Learning is power, and no Church can succeed permanently without it. Yet it is not the only, nor often the chief, power. The Church has ever been, and must ever be, the great foster-mother of education. Great learning, however, is not incompatible with great corruption. Sanctified learning is a great blessing to a Church; but if unsanctified, it is but arming a madman with a sword. Surely we should "study to show ourselves approved of God." And Paul says, "Give attendance to reading." But while this is true, we are not to look to these things as the sole, or even the greatest, agent in doing good; for "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God," and God hath chosen the weak things of this

world to confound the things which are mighty. The little "stone cut out of the mountain" smote Nebuchadnezzar's great image. "Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." The wheels and the hands of the watch are indispensable, but we must not expect them to do the work of the mainspring. There is but little danger of giving too much attention to learning; yet we must not *trust* in it, but in Christ, for success.

4. The strength of a Church does not depend on its wealth; for, if it were thus dependent, then had Christ and his early disciples little or no power. They were, certainly, as a class, quite poor. Matthew, probably, was not poor; nor Nicodemus; nor Joseph of Arimathea; but the two last mentioned were, till the close, or near the close, of Christ's ministry, "secret" disciples. Yet the history of the Church shows that almost all the early disciples of our Lord were very poor. Wealth has been, is now, and ever will be, a great power in the Church; and the spiritual life of a people may often be measured by the manner in which this wealth is employed. Its sanctified use for God is but the outcropping of an inner spiritual life. Wealth, as a power, will be used either for or against the kingdom of Christ. That will be a glorious day for the Church when holiness to the Lord shall be written upon the bells of the horses; yet we must not trust in "uncertain riches." The burdens of the Church are not usually borne by men of great property. True, we sometimes have a Ewing, or a Finley, or a Murdock, to endow professorships in our colleges; and these are noble examples, though rare. But may we not look forward to the future hopefully for many such? Let us, however, not *wait* for them, nor trust in them. It is a notable fact that the burdens are generally borne by those who are in moderate circumstances, having "neither poverty nor riches."

5. The strength of a Church does not consist in an imposing ritualism. One may talk as much as he will of the "beauti-

ful service," but this does not make it acceptable to God. The beauty that belongs to the service of God is the "beauty of holiness." The sacrifice that God loves is the "broken and contrite heart." Indeed, we must get as few things as possible between us and Christ. Imposing ceremonies and surpliced priests will not take a soul to heaven. Pictures and robes must not come between us and Christ; but we must draw near to him and worship him with pure hearts fervently.

6. The strength of a Church is not in a particular mode of administering the ordinances. The ordinances of the Church may be wholly Christless. They are means of grace, and they are valuable and helpful only as we see Christ through them. The spectacles that we wear are neither the eyes nor the objects seen, but only helps to our vision, aiding our infirmity. By them the objects are magnified, or brought near. The sacraments are designed to bring Christ near to us. We may get to heaven without the wafer taken from the priest's finger, without the sacrament taken while kneeling at the altar, without baptism administered by plunging the whole body into water. If what is here averred be not true, then the greater part of the Church has made a great and fatal mistake. It must be shown that these things bear better fruits, and that they who thus receive the sacraments are holier than others; for "by their fruits shall ye know them." If a man claims to have a better orchard than his neighbor, he must show better fruit. Are Churches that claim infallibility or ordination in a regular line from the apostles, or a regular succession of immersions down from the apostolic age, better Christians than others? That is the question. And the world will answer it, however high-sounding or pompous the claims may be.

Having thus considered in what the strength of a Church does not necessarily consist, it is now proposed to notice some of the elements of its growth:

1. A prime element of strength and growth is a pure, earnest, and able ministry. This is absolutely essential to the success of the Church. God has appointed this as one of the great means of saving the world. It is the lever by which God is now turning, and will turn, the "world upside down."

What Church has been permanently prosperous without the preaching of the word? Without a regular pastor few Churches have lengthened their cords and strengthened their stakes. While the gospel is the wisdom of God and the power of God, it must be brought to bear upon the people by a living ministry. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher?"

A ministry is not only necessary to the success of a Church, but it must be a pure ministry; for certain it is that no greater curse can be brought upon a Christian people than a venal and corrupt clergy. The Church will, to some extent, become like the ministerial guides. These are representative men, and by their character the Church itself will often be measured. But, in order to have pure pastors, they must be converted men. How can they tell of the danger and odiousness of sin who have never felt its power and guilt? How can that man feel for the penitent who has not himself tasted the cup of repentance? How can he direct the thirsty soul to a fountain of which he has not himself drunk? How can he rejoice with the new-born soul who has never felt the pulsations of a new and eternal life in his own bosom? How can he encourage the Christian warrior in the fearful conflict who has not himself entered upon the "good fight of faith"? If he would reconcile the world to God, he must not himself be an alien and a foreigner.

The ambassadors of Christ, too, must be solemnly in earnest. If they are not, the world will observe it, and will not believe. Men will see through the guise, and justly despise the hollow pretensions. Let not truth be told as if it were falsehood, nor let Christ be preached as if it were a matter of indifference whether he be accepted or not. There was no element that gave the fathers of our Church greater power with God, or with the people, than their *heart-earnestness*. Their convictions were clear and deep, and the word burned like fire in their bones. No great success in any enterprise can be expected without a heart all afire. Without this, little things dispirit and dishearten; with it, great obstacles are removed

and great difficulties surmounted. Earnestness gives perseverance, and perseverance, with earnestness, brings certain success. Without these elements the War of the Revolution would never have been fought through; Columbus would never have discovered a New World; electric thought would never have passed under the Atlantic, nor the iron horse have traversed the Rocky Mountains.

The ministry must not only be earnest, but able. They must be men of learning, men of thought, in advance of, rather than behind, the age. The battles of infidelity have again to be fought in another form, and under other opposing leaders who are constantly changing front. The clergy must lead in the conflict. The arguments of Chalmers do not meet the issues of to-day. Thought and learning were never more needed in the Church. Of the truth of this the writer has now, and ever has had, a deep conviction.

2. The necessity of unity in the Church must not be overlooked. Unity of doctrine is of the highest importance. This article has been written on the assumption that the Church has a correct doctrinal basis. But we must have not only this correctness, but unity of the doctrines likewise. Diversity just here has been most fruitful of contention and schism. A wholesome lesson was taught by the old heathen when he tied a bundle of rods together and told his sons to break them. They failed. He then handed the rods to them separately, and they were all easily broken. That will be a glorious day predicted by the prophet when the watchmen shall see eye to eye.

Unity of action also is necessary, as well as unity of faith. "If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." "A house divided against itself cannot stand." The general who divides his army into small bodies must expect to have these divisions destroyed one by one. The army of Emmanuel must, like Napoleon's, be massed in solid columns, and thrown upon the lines of the enemy. There must be unity of faith, unity of action, and unity of heart; and the cement of love must not be wanting.

3. The next element of a Church's strength is its spirituality; that is, its worship must be spiritual, and not merely

formal. Some form in congregational worship is necessary to order and uniformity. But our religion must not be so covered up with forms that the spirit will be lost in formalities. In the patriarchal age there were but few religious forms and much spirituality. Men were taught to believe God as an all-pervading Spirit. Under the later dispensation, however, in which there were numberless ceremonials pointing to the Christ to come, the people became lost in those formal rites, and gradually attached saving virtue to mere symbols. Christianity, like the patriarchal dispensation, and unlike the legal, has but few rites, and they are simple.

In the history of civilization we find great simplicity of manners characterizing the untutored and uncivilized, as well as the highly cultivated and refined. But pomp, and show, and display, characterize those nations that have left their original simplicity, while they have not yet attained to the highest civilization. Heathen worship consists almost wholly of external rites. Mohammedanism, though an advance upon heathenism, and embracing much less of vain ritualism, has but little spirituality. Roman Catholicism has, perhaps, fewer ceremonial usages, while it has more life, than Mohammedanism. But a pure Protestantism presents few rites, and those are of the simplest character, in the highest type of a pure and spiritual Christianity. Spirituality implies the presence of the Holy Spirit with, and in, the worshiper. "Ye," said Paul, "are the temple of the Holy Ghost." The language of Jesus to the woman of Samaria is, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." If the Church were as spiritual as it ought to be, and might be, no earthly power could resist its influence. The world would be compelled to take knowledge of us that we have been with Christ. It might not be necessary to say that, if we have a spiritual Church, we have, as a matter of course, another element of strength—a prayerful Church; but prayerfulness so necessarily grows out of, and attaches itself to, spirituality, that it is not necessary to dwell upon it as a distinct point in this article.

4. The next and last tower of strength that should be mentioned is *family religion*. There is no greater bulwark of our reli-



gion than this. Yes, "tell it to the generations following." Could you dry up the little springs that break out at the foot of the hills, you would dry up the creeks, and then the smaller rivers and the larger ones would be dried up, and finally the mighty "Father of Waters" would cease to pour his unmeasured flood into the Gulf. The want of family religion would bring upon the Church a greater drought than that which cursed Israel in the days of Elijah. It will not do to give up entirely the training of our children to boarding-schools or Sabbath schools, however important these may be in their respective spheres. The seeds of piety must be sown in the heart of the child by the parent by home instruction, and the parent must not, cannot, transfer this duty to others. Heaven has imposed the obligation; and, though other means may be, and should be, used as helps, yet the Christian father or mother cannot be guiltless, if the responsibility is shifted. As in the patriarchal age, every parent must be the priest, as well as the king, in his own family. It is to be feared that, in the multiplicity of book and Church facilities, this home-training may be forgotten. If so, the Church and the world *must* feel most fearfully the effects. It has been said that the corruption of Paris can be traced to the fact that the children have no homes. They are literally brought up homeless. The child must be taught to venerate the Church and respect the minister, but he must not, Roman Catholic-like, leave his religion *in* the Church, and commit the keeping of his soul's salvation to the priest. Remove family religion from our Jerusalem, and one of the strongest bastions of our spiritual fortress will be gone. The hope of the Church is in its children. This must be seen, known, and felt.

Other important elements of the strength of a Church might be considered; but, for the present, the foregoing will suffice. All things connected with Christianity are strong only as Christ is in them. In the gospel we have the wisdom of God and the power of God. In the words of the Psalmist, we may say: "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of his holiness. Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is Mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King."

## BOOK NOTICES.

*The Life and Letters of Hugh Miller.* By PETER BAYNE, M. A.  
Gould & Lincoln, Boston. 2 vols. 8vo.

The works of Hugh Miller have had quite as large a circle of readers in America as in Great Britain; and nowhere has his genius been more admired, or his sudden death more deplored. The volumes will form an enduring monument to the learning of the Cromarty geologist. In them the *man* is seen to have been far greater than the *author*, and to have built up a character grander than his works. Hugh Miller was one of the true heroes of our age; and, since Benjamin Franklin, there has been no finer example of a self-made man. He was a born philosopher; and, by universal consent, he became one of the first geologists of his day.

Mr. Miller was the leading spirit in the disruption which resulted in the formation of the Free Church of Scotland. In this contest he was sometimes violent and over-sarcastic; but he was never narrow-minded in defending his principles or in battling with his adversaries. He was a lover of truth, and scorned all evasions and tricks in argument.

No one can read the "Life and Letters" without feeling that he has been greatly profited; hence, with great pleasure, we recommend the volumes before us to our patrons.

*Life at Threescore and Ten.* By Rev. ALBERT BARNES.  
American Tract Society, New York. 12mo. Pp. 148.

Albert Barnes was, in our estimation, one of the greatest divines that this country has ever produced. As a minister he had few equals, and as a commentator, no superiors. He was the great light in the New School Presbyterian Church; and we have sometimes thought that, had it not been for him, that denomination would have been crushed in its infancy.

The little book before us was written by the distinguished author in his seventieth year. It is *intensely* interesting, and is almost worth its weight in gold. What a treasure it is for

the aged! No one can read it without weeping. Like every book that Mr. Barnes has given to the world, this is replete with solid thought and practical sense.

*The Conservative Reformation and its Theology:* As Represented in the Augsburg Confession, and in the History and Literature of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D.D., Norton Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary in the University of Pennsylvania. J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia. 4to. Pp. 840.

The high reputation which the author has gained as a scholar, produces a desire to read his writings. The book before us is a very readable one, on account both of its style and matter. In no work of which we have knowledge can one find so strong a defense of the literature, symbolism, and theology of the Lutheran Church. With great ability Dr. Krauth contests some of the positions taken by the learned Dr. Shedd on the Reformation theology and creeds. On the subject of Original Sin our author labors to prove that the Lutheran Church is anti-Pelagian, and that it discards the doctrine of regeneration by any kind of baptism save that of the Holy Ghost. Dr. Krauth also takes the position that a Conservative Christianity is the only kind which can be relied upon for the conversion of the world, and that the Lutheran Church is the embodiment of that idea. We agree with the Doctor in his premise, but we most respectfully beg leave to differ with him in his conclusion. Surely there are other Churches which, to say the least, have *equal* claims to Conservatism.

*The Far East;* or, Letters from Egypt, Palestine, and other Lands of the Orient. Illustrated with Engravings, Maps, Etc. By N. C. BURT, D.D. Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati. 8vo. Pp. 396.

With the exception of the Holy Land, no country, perhaps, so richly rewards the tourist as Egypt. Its physical features, its venerable antiquities, and its Bible associations, constitute a rare combination of attractions. The roots of Hebrew history strike deep into Egyptian soil. The Hebrew nation, in fact, had its birth in Egypt. The Egyptian civilization, mod-

ified by that of the Greeks and the Romans, has largely determined our own. Everything, therefore, pertaining to the land of the Nile is interesting to us. Dr. Burt is a fine writer; and, as a tourist, he seemed to observe only that which is important for his readers to know. To our patrons, therefore, we say, Buy the book and read it.

*The Bible and Modern Infidelity.* Lectures by Drs. McCOSH, THOMPSON, ADAMS, SCHAFF, HAGUE, and HOVEN. Ziegler & McCurdy, Philadelphia.

This is a charming book. It should be in the library of every Christian, especially of every minister. The truth is, we have not for a great while read a book which so deeply interested us. The infidel theories of the day are boldly met, and the advocates completely demolished.

*Religious Denominations of the World:* Comprising a General View of the Origin, History, and Condition of the Various Sects of Christians, the Jews, and Mahometans, as well as the Pagan Forms of Religion Existing in the Different Countries of the Earth: with Sketches of the Founders of Various Religious Sects. By VINCENT L. MILNER; with an Appendix brought up to the present time, by J. NEWTON BROWN, D.D. William Garretson & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Galesburg, Ill.; Columbus, Ohio; Nashville, Tenn.

This book should be in every library. It is almost the only one of the kind, which has come under our observation, that does justice to the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. We cannot, therefore, do the publishers a greater favor than by inserting a paragraph or two taken from the work. Under the caption, Cumberland Presbyterians, we find the following language:

"No Church, perhaps, has increased more rapidly than has this young and vigorous denomination. Its doctrines seem to have been popular, not only with the masses, but with those of high culture and refinement. Although a classical course of instruction is not made a *sine qua non* to entering the sacred profession, yet no ecclesiastical organization, it is believed, more strongly favors a highly educated ministry. As confirmation of this, the Church, though in its infancy, not only stands abreast with the older and more powerful denomina-

tions in the institutions of learning established for the education of both sexes, but it now embraces in its ministry many of the fine scholars and vigorous thinkers of the age. Nor is this denomination behind others in its periodical literature, as its highly respectable Weeklies, Monthlies, and Quarterlies will testify.

"A prominent trait in this body of Christians is its *conservatism*. The great civil war between the North and the South—a conflict which deluged the United States with blood, and which rent in twain the leading denominations not before severed—was not sufficient, it seems, to divide the Cumberland Presbyterian Church! This denomination has never prostituted to political ends either the pulpit or the religious press. With it the Church has ever been considered an asylum for the heart, and not an arena for fierce, bitter controversies in reference to the kingdom of Cæsar.

"The General Assembly has under its superintendence 24 synods, 100 presbyteries, 1,400 congregations, 1,250 ministers, 250 licentiates, 300 candidates for the ministry, and over 125,000 communicants. The number of communicants in some estimates has been placed considerably higher than this. The lowest has here been stated. Reckoning four children, and other adherents, to each communicant, which it will be acknowledged is a very low estimate, there will be found 500,000 persons connected with this branch of the Redeemer's kingdom."

*Practical Religion; A Book for the People.* By Rev. J. N. EDMISTON. Board of Publication of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn. 16mo. Pp. 202.

The author of this little volume is an efficient, consecrated minister in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. The book is full of plain, practical, sensible suggestions. The author lays "the ax at the root of the tree," and, without fear, hews down the mighty oak as well as the insignificant bramble. Would that every household had many such books; we then might hope to have a practical piety based upon the inspired word of God.

[Other Book Notices crowded out.]

